

THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY.

APRIL, 1903.

ARTICLE I.

OBLIGATIONS OF OTHER COMMUNIONS TO THE LUTHERAN CHURCH.

BY P. ANSTADT, D.D.

Luther did not intend to form a new church organization; he wanted only to reform the existing Romish Church in its doctrines and practices. Hence we speak of the *Reformation* of the 16th century. But Luther's work did result, under God, in the establishment of a new denomination, which claims to be the mother of Evangelical Protestantism, and embraces a membership of over sixty millions within its pale.

Neither did Luther wish this church, after its organization, to be called by his name, but simply *The Evangelical Church*, in contrast to the unevangelical Romish Church. But the Romanists call us *Lutherans*, in derision, out of hatred to Luther, and we are not ashamed of this name, as the early Christians also gloried in Christ's blessed name when they were first called so by the heathen at Antioch. We call ourselves *Evangelical Lutherans*; not only in distinction from the Romanists, but also from other fundamental errorists, such as the Socinians and Rationalists, who reject the doctrines of the Augsburg Confession; for when a church ceases to be evangelical it also ceases to be truly Lutheran. To the question, Under what obligations are other communions to the Lutheran Church? I reply:

VOL. XXXIV. No. 2. 1

1. *The world owes its civil and religious liberty to the Lutheran Reformation.* Before Luther's time the popes were both secular and spiritual rulers (as they vainly pretend to be yet); they claimed the right to exercise dominion over all rulers and countries in the whole world. They exercised the power and authority of crowning and deposing kings. One pope, after placing the crown on a certain king's head, immediately kicked it off again, to demonstrate his right and power to elevate and depose earthly rulers. King Henry IV, of Germany, was compelled to stand three days, barefoot, in the snow, in front of Pope Hildebrand's castle at Canossa, before he would admit him into his presence, or take the ban off his kingdom.

But how changed is the situation now! The pope has been deprived of his temporal possessions, the city of Rome is now the capital of the Kingdom of Italy, and the poor old man, Gregory XIII, bewails his lot as "The Prisoner in the Vatican." And now no ruler or government on earth, even where Roman Catholicism is the State religion, will admit that the pope has any right, power or authority in civil affairs.

The same holds true also in regard to religious liberty. Martin Luther, the little monk of Wittenberg, was the first who successfully defied the pope's power over the conscience, and was the instrument in the hand of God in restoring the liberty of the Gospel to the world. In 1517 he nailed his famous 95 Theses to the door of the castle church of Wittenberg, in which he denounced the sale of popish indulgences, and proclaimed the doctrine of justification by faith in Christ. The strokes of his hammer resounded through the civilized world; and when the pope sent his bull of excommunication against him, Luther took that bull (figuratively) by the horns, marched through the Elster-gate out of Wittenberg, at the head of the faculty and students of the University, built a bonfire and consigned that bull, together with the pope's decretals, to the flames.

This is what Michelet, a French Roman Catholic, writes in the preface of his book, *The Life of Luther*, p. vii: "Luther was in fact the restorer of liberty to the ages which followed his

era. He denied it in theory, indeed, but he established it in practice; if he did not absolutely create, he at least courageously signed his name to the great revolution, which legalized in Europe the right of free examination. To him it is due, in a great measure, that we in the present day exercise in its plenitude that first great right of the human understanding to which all the rest is annexed, and without which all the rest is naught. We cannot think, speak, write or read for a single moment without gratefully calling to mind this enormous benefit of intellectual enfranchisement. The very lines which I here trace, to whom do I owe it, that I am able to send them forth, if not to the Liberator of modern thought?"

But the world also owes its present spiritual elevation to Lutheranism. "At the time of the Reformation darkness covered the earth and gross darkness the people." Ignorance prevailed from the lower classes of the poor people up to the priests, bishops and even the popes. Charles V had a translation of the Augsburg Confession made into Italian, to send to the pope, because the Holy Father did not understand Latin. Melancthon was sent on a tour of visitation in the Electorate of Saxony to ascertain the spiritual condition of the people. Beginning among the clergy, he found some of them who did not possess a single book; one did not know the Ten Commandments, much less the Apostles' Creed, and their life was a sink of moral pollution. But among the common people, Lord have mercy! They knew nothing of God; the commandments, only by hearsay. One peasant repeated the 4th commandment thus: "Thou shalt love *thy* father and *my* mother," The Lord's Prayer could seldom be repeated entirely by any of them. A young man whom Melancthon asked, "On whom do we Christians believe?" replied, "On Abraham, Isaac and Jacob." To the question, "What is the name of him who has saved us?" the answer was given: "Pontius Pilate?"* (*Popular Life of Philip Melancthon*).

**Nicholas Copernicus*, a cotemporary of Luther, (born in Prussia, Feb. 19, 1473; died June 11, 1543), discovered the Planetary System, according to which the earth and the planets revolve around the sun as their com-

Even the Romish Church has been benefitted by the Lutheran Reformation. Doctrinally, she is more corrupt and unscriptural now than ever before, as for instance, in the doctrine of the Infallibility of the Pope, and the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary. But the people in the Romish Church do now enjoy more civil and religious liberty, intelligence and material prosperity than they did before and at the time of the Reformation, especially in those countries where Protestantism is predominant. Any one can easily convince himself of this by comparing the countries where Protestantism prevails with such lands as Spain or Italy, where the Reformation was hindered or crushed by persecution, or in our own new possessions of Porto Rico and the Philippines, or in Cuba, where Romanism has had undisputed sway for the last 400 years.

II. *To the Lutheran Reformation the world is indebted for an open Bible.* Luther had never seen an entire Bible, either in his father's house, or during his school years in Mansfeld, nor until he found a Latin copy in the University of Erfurth, chained to the floor of the library. The Bible is on the *Index*

mon center. He was either too modest or afraid to publish his book, and the manuscript still remains in the library of the Bishop of Ermland. It was printed after his death, which was well for him; for the learned-Galileo, professor at Pisa (born Feb., 1564, died 1642), developed the Copernican System still further, and published his immortal work on Astronomy, but was compelled to recant his error (?), yet whispered to himself: "It moveth still." But he was sentenced by the "Holy Inquisition" to three years' imprisonment, and required, once a week, to repeat the seven penitential Psalms of David. This occurred during the pontificate of Urban VIII, who was regarded as one of the learned popes.

The Theological Faculty of Paris declared, about this time, that religion would be destroyed if the study of Greek and Hebrew was allowed. The Mendicant Monks went to still greater extremes. One of them, the notorious Hochstraten, demanded that all Hebrew books should be burned. Conrad Hererbach, one of his followers, esteemed a worthy and honorable man, announced: "They have discovered a new language called Greek, against which we must be on our guard; she is the mother of all heresies. I see a book in the hands of many people, which they call *The New Testament*. It is a book full of thorns and poison. As regards the Hebrew, my dear brethren, it is certain that those who study it instantly become Jews" (*Viller's Influence of the Reformation*).

Expurgatorius—that is, the list of forbidden books. The Bible was then and is still, in the Romish Church, one of the prohibited books. The Papists teach that the common people do not need to read the Bible, but that the Church can teach them all that is necessary for them to know. But how different is it now! The Bible has been, since the Reformation, translated into more than 400 languages and dialects, and is scattered in many millions of copies among all the nations and peoples and kindreds of the earth, and can now be circulated freely not only in Protestant countries and heathen lands, but also in all Roman Catholic countries, such as France, Italy, Spain and Mexico. Yea, even in Rome itself the Bible is freely sold and given away without let or hindrance.

The Germans all over the world are indebted to Luther and Melancthon for the best translation of the Bible into their native tongue. Luther's translation of the Holy Scriptures has established the style of classic German over every part of the world where that grand language is now written or spoken. If a German Baptist, Mennonite or Tunker brother tells you he is opposed to an educated ministry, and that he preaches as the Spirit gives him utterance, ask him to look at the title page of his Bible, and there he can read: *Die Bibel, oder die ganze Heilige Schrift, des alten und neuen Testaments, nach Dr. Martin Luther's Uebersetzung*.^{*} If Luther and his associates had not been learned men, understanding the Greek and Hebrew languages, all German people, together with our Tunker brethren, would have had no Bible at all, nor any help "to speak as the Spirit gives them utterance."

III. *A number of Protestant Denominations are largely indebted to the Lutheran Church for their Doctrinal Confessions of Faith.* The Augsburg Confession is the mother Symbol from which most Evangelical Churches have derived their doctrinal teachings.

The Moravian Manual contains the following declaration of the faith of that denomination: "In common with the whole

^{*} The Bible, or the whole of the Holy Scriptures, according to Dr. Martin Luther's translation.

of Christendom it declares its adherence to the doctrines contained in the Apostles' Creed, and recognizes further that in the first twenty-one doctrinal articles of the *Augsburg Confession*, as being the first and most general confession of the Evangelical Church, the chief doctrines of the Christian faith are clearly and simply set forth."

The Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England, as her confession of faith is called, were mainly taken from the Augsburg Confession. *The Dictionary of Church History of the Protestant Episcopal Church* gives the following information on this subject:

"A body of articles of religion was presented by Luther, Melancthon and their associates to the German Diet at Augsburg, June 25, 1530, which is called the Augsburg Confession. The first part of the Augsburg Confession consisted of XXI articles. The English Church, by distinct convocational enactment, rejected the supremacy of the pope. This was the first decisive act which involved the English Church in the flood of the Reformation. Naturally the continental Reformers were conferred with, and a strong effort was made, in which both Henry VIII and Cranmer joined, to induce Lutherans, and especially Melancthon, to meet and confer with the English Convocation. In the summer of 1538 a body of XIII articles was agreed upon, of which the following are the titles:

- I. Of the Unity of God, and Trinity of Persons.
- II. Of Original Sin.
- III. Of the Two Natures in Christ.
- IV. Of Justification.
- V. Of the Church.
- VI. Of Baptism.
- VII. Of the Eucharist.
- VIII. Of Penitence.
- IX. Of the Use of the Sacraments.
- X. Of Ministers and the Church.
- XI. Of Ecclesiastical Rites.
- XII. Of Things Civil.

XIII. Of the Resurrection of the Body, and the Last Judgment."

It will be seen from the above, that the titles of the Articles are taken almost literally from the Augsburg Confession, and the doctrines confessed in them are substantially the same.

IV. Perhaps no other denomination has received so much help from the Lutheran Church as the Methodists in their various branches. Methodism owes its very existence to the Lutheran Church. Without Luther's writings Methodism, humanly speaking, would have no existence on earth. John Wesley, the founder of Methodism, gratefully acknowledges Luther's Preface to St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, which he heard read in a Moravian prayer-meeting in London, as the means, under God, of his conversion, and the assurance of his adoption as a child of God. From Luther Wesley learned what he had never known before, namely, the doctrine of justification by faith in Christ alone.

The Romish Church teaches the unscriptural doctrine of justification and salvation by works, but Luther proclaimed the doctrine of justification by faith, "the doctrine by which the Church must stand or fall."

V. Many denominations in this country have received some of their best preachers from the Lutheran Church. Peter Melchoir Muehlenberg, the eldest son of the Rev. Dr. Henry Melchoir Muehlenberg, the Patriarch of the American Lutheran Church, was ordained a priest of the Church of England, because as a Lutheran minister he could not be the pastor of a Lutheran Church in Woodstock, Virginia, where church and state were at that time united, and he was required to be a member of the Church of England and a loyal subject of king George III.

William Augustus Muehlenberg, a great-grand-son of the Patriarch, author of those beautiful hymns, "I Would Not Live Away," and "Saviour, Like a Shepherd Lead Me," left the Lutheran Church because he could not understand German preaching, and joined the Episcopal Church. He was ordained a priest by Bishop White, and became rector of an Episcopal

church in Lancaster, Pa. He died in New York City in 1877.

There are numerous ministers of Lutheran extraction in nearly all Protestant denominations, but most among the Methodists, United Brethren, and Evangelicals or Albrights. The principal reason for this is the ease with which young men can enter the ministry in those denominations. In our Lutheran Church a young man is required to take a full course in college and seminary before he can enter the ministry, which requires eight or ten years of the best part of his life, and the expenditure of one or two thousand dollars. But in any one of the above named churches he advances from a class-leader to an exhorter, local preacher, circuit rider, city pastor, or bishop.

A number of books on theology or church discipline are given him to read, on which he is annually examined until he is found qualified for ordination. In the meantime he is placed in charge of a mission station or a circuit at a small salary, and is thus at no pecuniary outlay for his education. I could name a number of instances where young men of Lutheran extraction have entered the ministry in the Methodist, United Brethren, and Albright churches, in this way, one or two of whom have, however, expressed to me their regrets, that they did not remain in the mother Church and enter her ministry. I could also tell of ministers who, after having spent some time as preachers in one or the other of the above named denominations, did return to the mother Church and labor in her ministry. It is due to state, that the above named denominations have now also established colleges of their own, and require higher literary qualifications from their candidates for the ministry than they did formerly.

VI. All Protestant denominations are more or less indebted to the Lutheran Church for some of the best lay members of their congregations. We have supplied them with some of the most valuable materials out of which they have built up their churches. For about 300 years large German Lutheran congregations have existed in London and other parts of Great Britain. Their descendants have been mostly absorbed by the Church of England. I do not know of a single English Luth-

eran Church in England, Scotland, Wales or Ireland. The late Queen Victoria was confirmed in a Lutheran Church in Germany, and the Queen of King Edward VII is also a Lutheran by birth and education. It would be difficult to give the exact number of European monarchs who have married Lutheran wives.

In our own country especially, has the Lutheran Church been a feeder of the other denominations for nearly 200 years. It was the insane policy of the early German pastors to discourage English preaching. Some declared, that "die reine Lehre," that is, the pure Lutheran doctrine, could be taught and perpetuated only in the German language. Some years ago a friend of mine, belonging to the Missouri Synod, told me that the German language would soon become "die Weltsprache," that is, the universal language of the world. "Don't you see," said he, "how they are studying German in all the schools and colleges?" But that dear brother has since had the good sense to begin English preaching in his own church, for his congregation would have died out with the demise of the old fathers and mothers, if he had not retained his young people by the introduction of English services.

If you will go through one of the grand Episcopal churches in New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, or any other large city of our country, and read the labels on their pew doors, you will find a larger portion of them bearing German names. Thousands of German immigrants annually land upon our shores, the largest proportion of whom are Lutherans; if they and their descendants had been retained in the Lutheran Church, we would now be by far the largest Protestant denomination on the American continent.

And yet this suicidal policy is still pursued by some of our German pastors. Not very long ago I read in the church papers of an attempt to establish an English mission in South Brooklyn, N. Y. But objection was made to the planting of an English mission within three squares of a German Lutheran church.

A large number of our people have been proselyted in the

Methodist Church and its various branches. Particularly has the Evangelical or Albright denomination been built up out of Lutheran material. Jacob Albright, the founder of that denomination, was a pious, gifted, German Lutheran layman, in eastern Pennsylvania. It was during the period of Rationalism, before our General Synod, or the East Pennsylvania Synod, was organized, when piety was at a low ebb, when coldness and dead formalism prevailed, when there were no Sunday-schools, no prayer-meetings, and the few praying people in the Church were persecuted and derided with such epithets as "Pietisten," "Knierutcher," "Betschwester," etc. They were thus practically driven out of the Church, and compelled to seek a refuge where they could worship God without being molested or made afraid.

Such desertions occur only where the Church has degenerated into dead formalism, not where active, vital piety prevails. An Albright preacher once complained to the writer about the hardships he endured. He had four or five appointments, every winter he had to hold protracted meetings of several weeks' duration in each appointment. Overheated in the church or schoolhouse, he would often take cold on his way home in the winter nights. Many of the converts backslided during the following summer, and would have to be converted over the next winter. "But," said he, "when we get a Lutheran to our anxious bench who gets through, he *sticks*; he has been *catechised*." Wherever our Church is spiritually alive our members remain steadfast and do not desert us. I once remarked to the Episcopal rector here in York: "Your church is, I believe, one of the oldest in town, but you have only one small congregation, while we Lutherans have ten or eleven. How do you account for this?" He replied: "Our Church is largely composed of the descendants of the Germans, but the thick-headed Lutherans here now are so stubborn and bigotted that we can seldom get one of them to unite with the true Apostolic Church."

VII. We are still supplying other denominations in different parts of the country with some of their best members. A

writer in one of our own church papers makes the following statements :

"Our liturgists and high church Lutherans maintain that in order to retain the German immigrants in our Church we must imitate closely the forms and usages of the Fatherland; and yet I cannot reconcile this position with the fact, that thousands of our most devout people are gathered in by denominations the farthest removed from such usages. Why should some of the largest and most spiritual congregations in the cities be German and Swedish Methodist ?

"In an interview with an intelligent Swede of the Methodist Church, in Burlington, Iowa, I found the key to the situation. He declared that reaction against formalism, and a longing for spiritual life, had begun already in the old country, where the state imposed church membership as part of citizenship without spirituality. The result of which was a large predominance of formalism.

"In Sweden the demand for spirituality was championed by the distinguished reformer Waldenstrom, founder of the true Church of Sweden, who has been a member of the Swedish Parliament for nineteen years. He is called the second Luther, and is a persistent foe to all shams, civil or religious.

"The same is true of the missionary activities of the Methodists in Germany. Why do these proselytes leave their mother church and support an independent Methodist pastor, and yet by compulsion pay their tax to the State Church, if their souls had been fed with the true bread of life in the State Church ? My Swedish brother declared that thousands of foreign Lutherans come to this country to find religious liberty, and if they are to be taxed for religion they want more than shells.

"In regard to the ministry he made this alarming statement. That many of the pastors who are appointed by the State and educated in the universities where the professors are Rationalists, do not make any claims to true Christianity, but were Rationalists and unbelievers.

"My interviewer landed in New York twenty years ago, hoping to find the American Lutheran Church, but when he found

the formal, perfunctory Church of Europe with its drunkenness and Sabbath desecration he turned away from it, and became one of the organizers of what is now the largest Swedish Methodist Church in New York."

"The Mission of the General Synod. Shall not the General Synod, which stands for aggressive spiritual Lutheranism, and is 'not entangled with the yoke of bondage,' give these longing souls a place in its fold? While other branches of the Lutheran Church, which seem called to reproduce the European customs on American soil, may play their part in gathering the formal followers of Luther, let the General Synod fill her God-given place in supplying the spiritually minded with a congenial home. Instead of clamoring against other denominations for making mission material of them, let us send missionaries among them, who are full of the Holy Ghost, to supply not only their heads with orthodoxy, but feed their souls also with the true bread from heaven."

I have given this large extract from this writer's article, because I think it will be interesting and suggestive to my readers; but I presume they will not all entirely agree with him. I think he has taken an extreme view of the subject, and very much overstated the facts in the case. It is, indeed, deplorably true, that most of the professors in our German universities are Rationalists, but there are also a number of very learned and pious orthodox professors in those universities, whose lectures are more numerous attended by students of theology, than those of the Rationalists. There are also, it must be confessed, some unbelieving preachers in the German pulpits, which is one of the evil consequences of the union of church and state, where the civil power appoints the pastors and pays their salaries, but the people who are habitual church goers and communicants, as a rule, are pious and orthodox believers. But in this country we have, so far as I know, no rationalistic professors in any of our Lutheran colleges or seminaries, German or English. In truth there seems to be a rivalry, as to which of our institutions has the highest claim to orthodoxy. So also the pastors of our churches, both German and English, are orthodox and pious;

there is not a rationalistic preacher, so far as my knowledge extends, in any one of our Lutheran Synods, but there is rather a tendency towards ultra confessionalism. The only pulpits occupied by Rationalists are in the so-called Independent churches and synods and in the "Protestantischer Verein." And as regards the German people, whatever may be said about their drinking habits and Sabbath-desecration (and, indeed, our American English population have not much to boast of in this respect), those who go to church at all, are, as a rule, pious, believing Christians. Hence there is no reason why a German immigrant should forsake the Lutheran Church in this country, because of Rationalism among her ministers or the want of piety among her members.

Neither do I think that any German immigrants forsake the Lutheran Church on account of the forms of worship which they find in some of our churches, else why should so many of them be drawn to the Episcopal Church, where they find far more extended liturgical services than in any of our Lutheran churches? Indeed, a pious German Lutheran will naturally be glad to find the same forms of public worship here to which he has been accustomed in the Fatherland. It is not, therefore, on account of doctrinal or liturgical reasons why some Lutherans forsake the Church of their fathers; there are other reasons, a few of which I will briefly mention:

1. There are many nominal members in the Church who have been baptized and confirmed, but have never experienced a change of heart, nor live a truly Christian life. Some of these are attracted, perhaps by curiosity, into a Methodist revival meeting, convicted of sin, and find peace in believing in Christ. These will naturally unite with the church in which they have experienced that happy change.

2. Some worldly-minded Lutherans, having become prosperous and wealthy, are ambitious to rise into a higher social position or more fashionable society, than they enjoyed among their poorer Lutheran brethren, join an aristocratic Episcopal congregation, regardless of differences in doctrine or forms of public worship.

3. Many Lutherans are also lost to the Church by inter-marriage with members of other denominations, though this rule also works both ways.

4. But our greatest loss at present results from our inability to supply our numerous membership scattered over the vast extent of the American continent. There are thousands of Lutherans, Germans, English and Scandinavians living in towns, villages and counties of the United States and Canada, where there is no Lutheran church, or where the preaching is in a language which they can understand. Consequently they unite with a congregation of some other evangelical denomination, in which they can enjoy the means of grace for themselves and their children. This condition of things is, however, taking a more favorable turn through the energetic operations of our Home Mission and Church Extension Boards, and we shall not have such large losses to mourn from this source as we have had in the past. The Lutheran Church in this country, notwithstanding her losses in the past, and whatever losses she may yet sustain in the future, is growing numerically faster than any other Christian denomination in the land. She is now numerically the third, and with her present rate of increase it will not be many years hence till she shall be, as regards the number of her communicants, the second or the first.

OUR OBLIGATIONS TO OTHER DENOMINATIONS.

It may now be asked: Are there no reciprocal obligations? Do we Lutherans owe nothing to other evangelical denominations? I reply, Yes, very much.

1. We owe the Moravians a debt of gratitude for their noble example of zeal for foreign missions. They excel all other denominations in this respect. They are the only church on earth that has more converts in the foreign field than members in their home churches.

2. The Presbyterians and Methodists have set us a bright example of liberality in their contributions for benevolent purposes. The Methodists have resolved to raise \$20,000,000 for education and mission purposes, to inaugurate their entrance

into the twentieth century. The whole of that amount has been secured.

3. We are indebted to other denominations for most of the English hymns we sing in our public worship. The most prolific writers of English hymns are Isaac Watts and the Wesley brothers. Watts was an English Dissenter and the Wesleys were Methodists. These and other devout writers of sister churches have furnished us Lutherans with our English hymns and spiritual songs, in which we pour out our souls in praise and thanksgiving to God. These psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, which all Protestant Evangelical Christians sing in their public worship, demonstrate the confession which we make every Lord's Day in our public worship. "I believe a holy Catholic Church; the communion of saints."

4. We are indebted to other denominations for our English church literature. No denomination on earth can boast of a literature so large in extent, so profound in learning, so Biblical and evangelical in doctrine, as the German Evangelical Lutheran Church. The German language contains the richest theological, exegetical, hymnological and devotional literature in the world. But when the transition from the German to the English language began in the American Lutheran Church, there was an almost total destitution of English Lutheran literature. Is it, therefore, any wonder that the ministers, who understood only the English language, and had to draw their help for the study of theology and the preparation of their sermons, entirely from English text-books of other denominations, were not thoroughly booked up in Lutheran doctrines and usages?

Dr. S. S. Schmucker was the first man who undertook to furnish English Lutheran candidates for the ministry with theological text-books. After having inaugurated his private theological seminary at Woodstock, Virginia, which was the nucleus of the seminary at Gettysburg, Pa., he translated *Storr and Platt's Biblical Theology*. It was printed in Andover in two volumes, in 1826; a second edition was published in 1836, and a third edition reprinted in England in 1845. After he became

Professor of Theology in the Seminary at Gettysburg he wrote and published an English text-book for his students, entitled *Elements of Popular Theology*, with special reference to the Doctrines of the Reformation, as avowed before the Diet of Augsburg in 1530. It is based on the twenty-one doctrinal articles of the Augsburg Confession, and passed through eight editions. His book on *Psychology* or Mental Philosophy passed through three editions. Besides preparing a number of other smaller works of a theological and historical character, he also compiled the first *English Hymn-book* for the General Synod, and translated *Luther's Small Catechism* into English. Gradually other theological, exegetical, biographical, sermonic and devotional English Lutheran books have been published by a number of our most gifted writers, until we have now a respectable but yet far from an adequate supply for all who need English Lutheran books.

But alas, the efforts to supply our ministers and church members with good English Lutheran literature is still poorly appreciated and inadequately encouraged. Go into any English Lutheran pastor's study, and see what kind of books you will find standing on the shelves of his library, and you will see comparatively a very small number of Lutheran works intermingled with those of other denominations. The same observation holds true also in regard to the book cases in our Lutheran families and Sunday schools.

5. We are indebted to other denominations for the *International Sunday-school Lesson System*. This was introduced some 35 years ago by Mr. B. F. Jacobs, a Baptist, and Mr. D. L. Moody, a congregationalist. This system has been almost universally adopted by evangelical denominations, in this country and also to some extent in England, Germany and Australia. It has also been generally adopted in the Lutheran Sunday schools of this country, though some have changed the name and arranged the lesson series according to the church year; yet in principle or theory it is the same. I claim the distinction of having published the first International Sunday-school lesson helps in the Lutheran Church. My

Sunday School Teacher's Journal has now entered on its thirtieth year, and I published explanatory notes on the International Lessons several years preceding, in the *American Lutheran*.

6. We are indebted to other denominations for the *Christian Endeavor*, or young peoples societies, which are now generally introduced into our churches. Some of our brethren have, however, adopted another name for the same thing, selected a different set of topics, and call it the *Luther League*.

7. The transfer of church membership is not all from the Lutheran Church to other denominations. Some of the most eloquent preachers in our pulpits, yea, some professors in our colleges and seminaries, have come over to us from other communions, and some of our most devout and active church members, are of Scotch, Welsh and Irish extraction.

The Lord Jesus Christ has one holy Church Militant on earth, and one glorious Church Triumphant in heaven. The Sacramental Host on earth is divided into different companies—soldiers to fight her spiritual battles, and laborers to cultivate her vineyard. Each division has its appropriate work and field assigned. We believe the Lutheran Church has her field of labor assigned to her by the Lord, which no other denomination could cultivate so well as she can.

The rice-fields of Georgia are in the low lands which in the winter are overflowed with water. The owners of those fields go out in boats and "cast their bread upon the waters." The grains of rice sink down into the mud at the bottom. There can be no wooden fences there, so they build mud walls to divide one field from another, in order that each owner may know and cultivate the particular field which belongs to him. In the spring the water dries up. Standing on a neighboring hill, and looking down on the valley, one can see nothing but the black soil and the mud walls. By and by the grain springs up and covers the vale as with a carpet of green. But the mud walls are still seen as the dividing lines between the fields. In the course of time the grains grow up, and you can see only the waving, golden harvest, and the mud walls have disap-

peared. Then the reapers come and gather the precious grain from all the fields into one common storehouse, where you can not tell which part of the rice in the storehouse comes from this field or what part has come from another field, but all has been brought together into one common receptacle.

So the Christian Church on earth is divided into different denominations; each has its appropriate field to work in, and there must be fences of doctrine and form to indicate the particular field which each one has to cultivate. But we must never build these walls of separation so high that we can not look over them, shake hands and say "Good morning."

But the harvest comes at the end of the world, the reapers are the angels, and the saints of all ages and nations and tongues will be gathered into the mansions of our Heavenly Father's house, where all denominational lines will be eliminated, and there will be one fold and one shepherd.

"Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will to men!"

ARTICLE II.

THE TWO REFORMATION THEOLOGIES.

BY PROFESSOR J. W. RICHARD, D.D.

Opportunity, inclination and a sense of professional duty, have combined to lead us to make a more extended study of Comparative Dogmatics and of Comparative Symbolics, than we have hitherto been able to make. The results of this more extended study are given in condensed form to the readers of THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY with the hope of contributing something to a better understanding of those two very important theological disciplines. Our method will be objective and historical, rather than subjective and critical. We shall try in this series of essays to exhibit the leading and differentiating characteristics of the two prevalent theologies of the Reformation, and also the consequences that went down thence into the Confessions of the two great sister churches of the Reformation, the Lutheran and the Reformed; though it is far from our expectation to be able to reach and to enunciate conclusions that will prove satisfactory to all of our readers, and thus make an end of controversy. The subject is so vast, and so profound, and can be viewed from so many different standpoints, that it is unreasonable to expect absolute agreement in answer to the question, What are the *primordia* of Lutheranism and of Reformedism? We aim here to bring the most important facts to the attention of our readers, and will account it an adequate reward of labor to learn that we have stimulated any one to make independent investigations of the *origines* of the two theologies that have shaped the course of Protestantism. We begin by analyzing and exhibiting the contents of that most characteristic, and, perhaps, most influential, of all of Luther's monographs, namely, his *De Servo Arbitrio*, * published in

* Erlangen Edition of Luther's Works, *Op. Lat. Var. Arg.*, VII, pp. 116-386.

December, 1525—a book that has feet, hands and a tongue, that walks and fights and speaks to this day, and commands the attention alike of the philosopher and the theologian. He who has not read this book and mastered its contents, has not yet entered fully into the depths of Luther's theology, and is not prepared wisely to distinguish that which is temporary and collateral in Luther's theology from that which is perennial and essential.

The ostensible and negative purpose of this book is to annihilate Erasmus' *De Libero Arbitrio Diatribe sive Collatio*; its real and positive purpose is to show how salvation is applied to man. He who does not view the book from this double standpoint will not be able to understand it, and consequently will not be able to distinguish that which is primary in the book from that which is secondary. The reader must also comprehend the method of the author, which is that of the orator, who asserts rather than argues, and in this treatise revels in wit, sarcasm, irony, metaphors, raillery, denunciation, *argumentum ad hominem*, philosophy, psychology, *reductio ad absurdum*, and in every device known to logic and rhetoric, besides fervent appeals to the Scriptures, with vigorous and apt, sometimes profound, and sometimes fanciful interpretations of the same. But it is exactly this method, so full of paradoxes, so passionate, so abundant in metaphors, so ill-adjusted in some of the parts, that makes it the hardest of Luther's books to interpret, if you descend to *minutiae*, though it is easy to interpret when the chief purpose is kept in view.

We set forth the main thoughts under appropriate rubrics.

I. PREDESTINATION.

There can be no doubt that this book contains a strong element of Predestination. But equally certain is it that the subject of Predestination is not held before us as a *teaching of the divine word*, and as an object of study and investigation. To establish these propositions we quote at length: "But why some are touched by the law, and others are not touched, so that the former receive and the latter condemn the offered grace, is another question, and is not treated in this passage by

Ezekiel, who speaks of the proclaimed and offered mercy of God, and not of that secret and awful will of God who ordains by his own counsel whom and what kind of persons he wishes to become capable and participant of his proclaimed and offered mercy. This will of God is not the object of research, as it is by far the most venerable secret of the divine majesty, is reserved to himself alone and is prohibited to us more religiously than the Corycian caves to the countless multitude.

"When now Diatribe captiously inquires, whether the holy Lord bewails the death of his people which he himself has wrought in them—for such a thing seems perfectly absurd—I reply, as I have already done: We must argue in one way concerning God, or the will of God proclaimed, revealed, offered to us, and made an object of worship, and in another way concerning God not revealed, not proclaimed, not offered, not made an object of worship. In so far therefore as God hides himself, and wills not to be known by us, he is nothing to us. For here holds good that motto: What is above us is not for us" (p. 221).

"The will of majesty abandons and reprobates some purposely, that they may perish; but we must not inquire why he acts thus; but the God who has such power and wills such things must be revered" (p. 228).

These two passages taken together, do unquestionably teach a double predestination. There is no way by which their plain meaning can be evaded (see also p. 154). But this Predestination resides in the secret will of God. It is not a part of the divine revelation; and there is *not a line in this book* in which the author connects the *double Predestination with the revealed will of God*, or intimates that *it is taught in the Holy Scriptures*. On the contrary, as will be hereafter shown, it is taught that it is the will of God as expressed in the Scriptures that all men should be saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth. "It is enough for us to know that there is a secret will of God, but what, or why, or how far, it wills, this we are positively forbidden to inquire into, to seek, to care about, to touch, but only to fear and to adore" (p. 222).

And again: "Therefore God in his majesty and nature must be left, for in this relation we have nothing to do with him; nor in this relation does he wish anything to be transacted by us with him; but in so far as he is clothed in and set forth by his word, in which he offers himself to us, do we have to do with him, and that word is his glory and beauty, and as clothed in that word he is celebrated by the Psalmist" (p. 222). He blames Erasmus for failing, in his ignorance, "to distinguish between the proclaimed God and the hidden God, that is, between the word of God and God himself. God does many things which he does not reveal to us in his word, and many things that he does not show us by his word that he wills. Thus he does not will the death of the sinner according to his word, but he does will it by that inscrutable will. Now our business is to look to the word, and to let alone that inscrutable will; for who could have recourse to that absolutely inscrutable and incognoscible will?" (p. 222).

In this distinction between "the proclaimed God," and "the hidden God," that is, "between the word of God and God himself," we are brought to a clear understanding of Luther's doctrine of Predestination. It is "the hidden God" that works death, and does not seek to remove it. It is the will of "the hidden God" that does all things according to its good pleasure; and this is the God that "foreknows nothing contingently, but foresees, purposes and accomplishes everything by an unchangeable, eternal and infallible will" (p. 133). "Do you (Erasmus) believe that he (God) foreknows unwillingly, or wills ignorantly? If he foreknows willingly, his will is eternal and immutable (because it is his nature); if he wills foreknowingly, his knowledge is eternal and immutable (because it is his nature).

"Hence it follows irresistibly that all things we do, and all things that are done, though they seem to us to happen mutably and contingently, do nevertheless happen necessarily and immutably, if you have regard to the will of God. For the will of God is effective, and cannot be thwarted, since it is by nature the very potency of God" (p. 134).

To confirm this deterministic position he quotes approvingly

several of the most fatalistic passages from Virgil: "All things are fixed by law;" "a day is appointed for every one;" "if thou canst break the terrible fates;" "finally he subjects his immortal gods to fate, to which even Jupiter and Juno necessarily yield. Hence they have invented those three immutable, implacable, irrevocable Fates" (p. 136); and he declares that "the knowledge of the Divinity is not more surely resident in the common people than is the knowledge of the predestination and prescience of God" (p. 137), though he repudiates the Stoic necessity.

This of course is Determinism. Nothing else can be made out of it. Things may *seem* to happen contingently, but in reality they happen necessarily. That is, as over against "the hidden God," no creature has self-determination. True, the man who drives the lame horse, drives him badly, and the man who hews with the serrated hatchet, hews badly (p. 255); but the query irresistably arises, How did the horse become lame, and how did the hatchet become serrated, since everything happens immutably and necessarily according to the secret will of God? that is, the horse became lame and the hatchet serrated by the will of God. There is no escape from this conclusion when once the premises are conceded. "When God works in the wicked and through the wicked wickedness is done; nevertheless God cannot do evil, though he works wickedness through the wicked, because being himself good he cannot do wrong, though he uses wicked instruments, which cannot resist the impetus and impulse of his power" (p. 255). But how did man become wicked? Nothing happens contingently, but everything by the will of God. Luther repels the imputation that God is in any sense the author of sin, but he does it didactically and categorically, not logically from his universal affirmative, that "all things happen necessarily and immutably if you have regard to the will of God."

Now Luther did not mean to construct a Theodicy. Had he attempted to reconcile the sovereignty of God, a postulate of reason, with the freedom of man, a datum of consciousness, he doubtless would have sacrificed one horn of the dilemma to the other, and would probably have shown, even before Kant,

that between the phenomenal and the noumenal there is an impassable gulf. Indeed it is evident that he perceived the antinomy. Things *seem to us to happen contingently*. In reality they *happen necessarily*, according to the sovereign will of God. His purpose at this place in his argument is to assert this sovereign will of God. But the God who is here brought under consideration is "the hidden God," such as Luther had learned to know him through the Scholastics, some of whose nice distinctions he has again and again used.

II. THE GOD-IDEA.

That Luther was influenced in his doctrine of the Lord's Supper by the Nominalistic philosophy, was demonstrated by Rettberg, in *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, 1839, pp. 69-136. We recall on the authority of Melancthon that Luther knew Gabriel Biel and Peter D'Ailly almost by heart, and that "he read Occam long and much; and preferred his acute reasoning to that of Thomas and Scotus."* We are prepared therefore to expect that the God-idea of the Venerable Inceptor and of the last of the Schoolmen should reappear when Luther comes to write about God. That it does reappear has been conclusively shown by Professor Ritschl in *Fahrbücher für Deutsche Theologie*, 1868, pp. 67 *et seqq*, according to whom "the hidden God, his majesty and nature, his essential will, his good pleasure, indicate how the individual person is regarded (*versehen*), and is brought by necessity to salvation or to damnation; while the will of God revealed in Law and Gospel, in the Incarnation, in word and sacrament, contains on the contrary, the destination of the *whole human race* to salvation, the coming short of which by individuals, appears, under this point of view, as their own fault" (pp. 79, 80). We find that Köstlin expresses a like judgment as to the meaning of the distinction, "the hidden God" and "the proclaimed God." Writing about Luther's doctrine of "the absolute power or majesty of God" and of God's "substantial will," Köstlin says:

* C. R., VI, p. 159.

"Into this we are not to seek to penetrate. The will of love is mentioned only in connection with the proclaimed God. With the essential will is combined foreknowledge. What God wills with *this* will he has seen from eternity. This wisdom, might, etc., are simply inaccessible to reason.

"To this will, for us inaccessible, belong the reasons for the divine *commands*. Adam fell because he listened to Satan, who disputed as to why God had forbidden to eat the fruit of one tree. We must also regard the divine judgments as incomprehensible. Especially belong here the eternal substantial divine willing and knowing in so far as they have reference to the salvation which is bestowed upon individual persons. As in connection with the proclaimed God there is the hidden God, so in connection with the revealed will of God that all should be saved, there is also a secret Predestination."*

One has only to read this book carefully to perceive this antinomy in Luther's *Gottesidee*, or rather to perceive that he has at the same time two different conceptions of God. Following the one conception he concludes for Predestination. Following the other he concludes for the universal will of salvation. Back of "the proclaimed God" is "the hidden God." But as this "hidden God" is unsearchable, and can never be known as regards either his will or his nature, so he cannot be an object of practical interest. It is enough for us to know that there is such a God, and to know that he knows and wills all things eternally and unchangeably. We must reverence such a God, and the thought of such a God keeps us humble (p. 153); but we cannot make such a God the object of our confidence. In the matter of salvation from sin, he is to us as though he were not—not an abstraction to be sure, but a being shut up within himself. He is a postulate, an hypothesis, assumed to explain the order of the universe, and the vicissitudes of events. But postulates and hypotheses can have no final authority over the conscience in matters of duty, and cannot furnish a foundation for faith, since faith has to do with evidence, that is, with phenomena—"the proclaimed God," the word, the sacraments, the

* II, p. 316.

incarnation—and has no logical right to conclude from the phenomenal to the noumenal, or to say that because it finds God so and so in revelation, therefore he *must* be so and so in himself. Hence “the hidden God” cannot come into the purview of religious knowledge.

This principle Luther certainly knew, and on this principle he unquestionably acted, as is clearly shown by his doctrine of the means of grace, in which he points for the thousandth time to the *verbum vocale*, and to the *verbum visibile*, and will know no God except him who lay in the manger and hung on the cross. Whether he was conscious of the antinomy in his *Gottesidee*, or not, we do not know. But neither in this book, nor, so far as we have observed, in any other, has he sought to remove it. But we do know that he held that a thing may be true in theology, and at the same time false in philosophy, and *vice versa*. In 1539, in true Nominalistic style, as over against the Sorbonne, he declared that philosophy and theology are distinct.* “It is the province of philosophy to understand by means of the reason, and the province of theology to believe *supra omnem rationem*. Faith is not bound and made subject to the rules and terms of philosophy, but is free.” There is no reason to believe that he was not influenced by the same Nominalistic principle in 1525. Hence we may conclude that he was not oppressed by a sense of contradiction in his *Gottesidee*. The idea of “the hidden God” *ex vi termini* does not come from revelation, and cannot be a matter of experience. It must then be a postulate of reason. The logical deductions thence are true, that is, true for the reason, but they do not bind the faith, since that is free, and, as experience testifies, is related to phenomena, and believes *supra omnem rationem*. Hence while “the hidden God,” “*ordinans suo consilio*” (p. 221), appoints one to salvation, and another to damnation (p. 250), “the incarnate God is sent that he might will, might speak, might do, might suffer, might offer, for all men, all things that are necessary to salvation” (p. 228).

The author brings these two thoughts to immediate juxtaposition: “Thus we say, the holy God does not deplore the death

* *Disputationen*, pp. 491, et seqq.

of his people which he works in them, but he deplores the death which he finds in his people and takes pains to remove it. But this is what the proclaimed God does, that we may be saved by the removal of sin and death. 'For he sent his word and healed them.' But the God who is hidden in his majesty, neither deplores nor removes death, yet works life and death, and all things in all. For he has not limited himself by his word, but has reserved to himself freedom over all things" (page 222).

In this last sentence we have the gist of the matter. The proclaimed God, by entering into relations with Man, necessarily limits himself by his word, with which alone we have to do in ascertaining our relations to the divine will. The hidden God is free to do as he pleases, and we are not justified in attempting to ascend by means of a postulate to the knowledge of the absolute divine operations whether of grace or of wrath. We are bound by the *means of grace*, the only things that can meet over finite conditions, and our minds must be withdrawn from the realms of speculation. This two-fold thought is also brought out with great clearness: "I assert, as I have already done, that we must not dispute about that secret will of majesty; and human rashness, which by its constant perversity, leaves the things that are necessary, to attack and encounter it, must be called off and restrained, lest it occupy itself with prying into those secrets of majesty which it is impossible to touch, because, according to Paul, it dwells in light which no man can approach unto. But let her occupy herself with the Incarnate God, or as Paul says, with Jesus crucified, in whom are all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge. By him she will learn abundantly what she ought to know and what she ought not to know about the hidden God. Therefore the Incarnate God says: I would, but thou wouldst not. The Incarnate God, I say, was sent into the world that he might will, might speak, might do, might suffer, might offer to all men all things that are necessary for salvation, though he offends very many, who, either abandoned or hardened by that secret will of majesty, do not receive him who wills, speaks, does, offers; as John says: The light shineth in the darkness,

but the darkness comprehends it not; and again: He came unto his own and his own received him not" (pp. 227-8).

And to those who captiously ask why God does not operate by his Spirit without the spoken word, he replies: "It hath pleased God, not without the word, but through the word to give the Spirit, that he may have us as co-workers to sound without what he alone breathes within wheresoever it pleases him, which nevertheless he could do without the word, but does not will to do so. Who are we that we should search out the cause of the divine will, and this will we ought to reverence, love, and adore, and we ought to put a restraint upon the rashness of reason" (p. 236).

These quotations, which are typical of the entire discussion from about p. 220 to p. 240, show conclusively that Luther means to limit our knowledge of the way of salvation, and of God's will of salvation entirely to the sphere of the phenomenal. He will have nothing to do with the transcendental, except to know that it is, and to reverence it as a tremendous fact. Faith must fix herself on the *spoken* word, on "the proclaimed God," and reason must be restrained. If God in the exercise of his own good pleasure sees fit to elect some individuals to eternal life, and to reprobate others to eternal death, that is his affair. If he reveals himself in the Incarnation, and by his word calls all to salvation, and shows that he wills the salvation of all, then and there begins our responsibility; that is, as Luther says again and again, we have to do with "the proclaimed God." With God in his nature we have nothing to do.

Philosophy may seek to remove the antinomy in Luther's *Gottesidee*; or it may blame Luther for not seeking to remove it; or it may blame him for introducing two different conceptions of God in the same treatise. But Luther, like every other thinking man, was forced to enunciate certain postulates about Deity. Besides, postulates about the absoluteness of God had been furnished him by his antagonist, and he had found them abundant in the scholastic philosophy. Through these postulates he saw God active in all creatures, and as exercising sovereign sway over all things. In revelation he saw God imposing lim-

itations upon himself, and adapting himself to the sense of responsibility which is fixed in every rational creature, and without which neither morality nor religion could exist. In harmony with the philosophical principles which he had embraced, the two conceptions could stand side by side. Each might be true in its own sphere.

But inasmuch as his aim was wholly religious and not philosophical, it was both natural and logical for him to press "the hidden God" into the back-ground, and even to ignore him when he stood in the way of "the proclaimed God." And though Luther repressed Philosophy in this treatise—"the temerity of reason must be restrained"—yet he, consciously or unconsciously, proceeded in the way of Philosophy. Of God in his absoluteness, that is, shut off from all relations with us, we can know nothing, since we know all that we know in and by means of relations. Neither is it lawful for us to conclude from revelation, or from what we know of "the proclaimed God," that God is such and such in his real being, since we cannot pass, by the process of thought, from the phenomenal to the noumenal, so that by means of our knowledge of the phenomenal we can affirm that we know perfectly the essence of the thing of which the phenomenon is a manifestation. What is the essence of light, heat, color; of the beautiful, the virtuous, the good? What is the essence of spirit, or of matter? We can never answer these questions absolutely and finally, and this is shown by the whole history of speculative thought. Nor is it of any practical utility that we should know the essence of things, since our interests are entirely subserved by the phenomena. We may conclude, and indeed must conclude, that there is an essence from which phenomena arise, but we cannot conclude indisputably as to the thing in itself, or as to the essence of the thing. When we pass beyond the boundary line of the phenomenal, we proceed by means of postulates that may or may not be conceded. In other words we speculate and rationalize; but speculations, and the conclusions of the natural reason, cannot impose a positive norm for the understandings of men.

In religion we are brought face to face with the Infinite Spirit. But who knows, by the natural reason, what the Infinite is? Without any doubt it is necessary for us to postulate his existence, and to conceive somewhat about him; but these operations of the mind are intuitions, and intuitions are inadequate guides in matters of religion. In this sphere we need revelation; that is, according to Luther, the self-limitation of God; and for the very reason that revelation belongs to the phenomenal, we have no right to conclude thence in an apodeictic manner that we know what God is in himself. We *know* him only in so far as he has revealed himself. The conclusion is inevitable that the God whose existence for us rests on postulates and hypotheses, can have very little practical interest for us when the main question is, How can we appropriate the salvation that God has provided? It is enough for us to know, and it may indeed be necessary to our thought to know, that back of "the proclaimed God," is "the hidden God" with unchangeable purpose and will, but for faith there is need of something *positive*, a *verbum vocale*, a *verbum visibile*; and that a sense of such need enters organically into the practice, if not indeed into the very idea, of religion, is shown by the fact that every religion has its "proclaimed God," in stone, or in wood, or in sun, moon and stars, or in oracles, or in sacred books.

Now this is exactly the position taken by Luther, in this, the most original, most profound, and most paradoxical of all the productions of his great mind. "The hidden God" is a vast *terra incognita*, a vast, profound, awful entity, that must be revered and adored, but cannot be apprehended. On the contrary, "the proclaimed God," the *Deus revelatus et incarnatus*, can be known, apprehended and realized in experience. This is the God who "holds converse with us" (p. 221).

So much as regards Luther's *Gottesidee* as set forth in this book. We turn our attention now to his conception of man.

III. THE LIBERUM ARBITRIUM.

Now while on the one hand it is demonstrable that Luther

makes no *positive* use of "the hidden God" as a basis of hope, expectation and faith in the matter of salvation, it is demonstrable also, on the other hand, that he makes use of "the hidden God" in a negative and destructive way against the *Liberum Arbitrium*, which custom makes it necessary for us to translate Free-will. This "hidden God," or the secret will of divine majesty, is the dark back-ground against which Luther projects his refutation of Erasmus's doctrine of the *Liberum Arbitrium*; or it may be regarded as the necessary philosophical correlate of his own doctrine of the *Servum Arbitrium*. All that God does he does necessarily and unchangeably by an eternal and infallible will. This is the thunderbolt that utterly annihilates Free-will (p. 130).

The relation of human conduct to God's infallible and unchangeable will is stated in the following paragraph: "I could have wished that another and better word had been introduced in our discussions rather than the one that is used, namely Necessity, since this word is properly applicable neither to the will of God nor to the will of man. Its signification is not sufficiently agreeable and congruous in this place, since it suggests to the understanding a certain kind of compulsion, and that which is contrary to the will. Besides, our question does not require this. For the will, whether that of God or man, does what it does, not by any compulsion, but merely by freedom and desire, which are truly free. Yet the will of God is immutable and infallible, and governs our mutable will, as Boethius says: 'Remaining fixed, thou makest all things move'; and our will, wicked in the extreme, of itself is not able of itself to do good. Therefore let the mind of the reader supply what the word necessity does not express, and understand thereby the immutable will of God, and the impotence of our own wicked will" (pp. 134-5).*

Again: "It stands fixed, even by your own testimony that

*This paragraph is given in the margin of the Erlangen Edition. But it is found in the text of the Jena Edition of Luther's works, an edition that originated in the desire to have Luther's works in the most complete form.

we do all things by necessity, and nothing by Free-will, so long as the power of Free-will is nothing and does nothing and can do nothing in the absence of grace; unless you by a new use of terms mean perfection by the word efficacy, in the sense that Free-will is able to begin and to will, but cannot accomplish anything, which I do not believe" (p. 158).

These passages furnish fair illustrations of Luther's argument while reviewing Erasmus's Preface, and while he is arguing along philosophical lines, and before he has begun to prove his position "by the authority of the Holy Scripture," and before he has called in "the proclaimed God" and explained the relation of the human *voluntas* to the call of the Gospel.

And now what is *Liberum Arbitrium*, over against which Luther sets "the hidden God," and the will of the divine majesty? Erasmus had defined it as "the power of the human *voluntas* by which a person is able to apply himself to those things which lead to eternal salvation, or to turn himself away from them" (p. 188); or, as Luther says: "Free-will, according to Erasmus, is the power of the *voluntas*, which is able of itself to will or not to will the word and work of God by which it is led to those things which surpass its thought and sense" (p. 192). Luther denies that there is any such power in man. He says: "You might perhaps rightly attribute *arbitrium* to man, but to attribute *liberum arbitrium* in divine things is too much, because the term *liberum arbitrium* in the judgment of all persons is properly spoken of that which is able to do and does toward God whatsoever things it pleases, constrained by no law, by no commandment" (p. 188).

It will thus be seen that the subject of discussion is the human *arbitrium*, to which Luther denies the attribute *liberum*. Almost at the very beginning of his work he says "*liberum arbitrium esse merum mendacium*, which like the woman in the Gospel, the more it is treated by the physicians the worse it fares" (p. 119); "that watchword: *vis liberi arbitrii est, vis liberi arbitrii est*, is nothing but an empty sound and a noise of words" (p. 168); "Free-will is a title that belongs to God, and can belong to no one except to the divine majesty alone"

(p. 158); "I have already said that Free-will is a title that belongs to God. This no one has yet attributed to it except the Pelagians, not even the Sophists" (p. 192); "*liberum arbitrium nihil est*" (p. 272); "There can be no such thing as Free-will in man, or in angel, or in any creature" (p. 336).

In establishing these assertions Luther appeals first to the foreknowledge and predestination of God. His argument is that if God foreknows nothing contingently and does everything necessarily there is no place for Free-will. On this basis already he claims the victory, even before he advances to the Scriptures, and says: "Thus too I might have put an end to this whole question about Free-will, since even the testimony of my opponents is on my side, and there is no stronger proof than the confession and testimony of an adversary when he witnesses against himself. But since Paul commands us to stop the mouths of babblers, let us advance to the very cause itself" (p. 188).

He now proceeds to show that the texts quoted by Erasmus in support of Free-will prove that man has no power to apply himself to those things that lead to eternal salvation. He then shows that certain texts, as Exodus 9 and Malachi 1, the force of which Erasmus had evaded, are powerful testimonies against Free-will. He makes his appeal first to Paul, "who utters nothing but thunderbolts against Free-will" (p. 338); and then to John "who of himself is an abundant and powerful devastator of Free-will" (p. 351). The argument is at length summed up as follows: "If we believe it to be true that God foreknows and foreordains everything, and that his prescience and predestination can neither fail nor be hindered, and that nothing happens except by his will—a truth that reason herself is compelled to yield—then by the testimony of reason itself there can be no such thing as Free-will in man, or in angel or in any creature. Again: If all believe that Satan is perpetually plotting and fighting with all his might against the Kingdom of Christ, so that he does not let his captives of the human race go, unless he be driven out by divine power, then it is evident that there can be no such thing as Free-will.

"So again: If we believe that original sin has so ruined us as to cause the greatest trouble even to those who are led by the Spirit, through striving against the good, then it is clear that there is nothing left in vain man that can turn itself to the good, but only to the bad. Further: If the Jews, following righteousness with all their might, rushed the rather into unrighteousness, and the Gentiles following after impiety, by grace and contrary to hope have attained to righteousness; then again it is manifest that man by his own work and experience cannot, without grace, will anything except evil. Finally; If we believe that Christ redeemed men by his blood, we are forced to believe that the whole man was undone, otherwise we shall make Christ either superfluous or the Redeemer of the vilest part, which is blasphemous and sacrilegious" (p. 367).

From this summing-up appears what Luther meant by Free-will: It is the natural man, born in sin, blinded in his understanding, alienated in his affections from God, the bond-slave of Satan, so that he is not able to "will the word and work of God." That is, he is not able to believe on Christ, and "not to believe on Christ is sin. But this sin is not as it were in the skin or in the hair, but in the reason itself and in the will." (p. 363).

To Erasmus's inquiry, Why have so many men of excellent understanding been blind on this subject? Luther makes the following reply: "They are blind with the praise and glory of Free-will, that that magnificently boasted power by which a man is able to apply himself to those things that belong to eternal salvation, by which seeing he sees not, and hearing he hears not, much less understands and seeks after them, may be made manifest. To this belongs what Christ, quoting Isaiah and the Evangelists, asserts: 'Hearing ye shall hear and shall not understand; and seeing ye shall not see.' What does this mean except that Free-will, or the human heart, is so trodden under foot by the power of Satan that unless it be miraculously raised up by the Spirit of God, it is not able to see or to hear those things that manifestly strike upon the eyes and ears—so great

is the misery and blindness of human nature" (p. 184). He also quotes Augustine as saying that "Free-will by its own strength cannot but fall, and has no power save to commit sins. On which account, says Augustine, it should be called Bond-will (*Servum Arbitrium*) rather than Free-will" (p. 193.) Hence as slaves we "all are compelled to sin; that is, we will sin and wickedness, we speak sin and wickedness, we act sin and wickedness" (p. 199). "Original sin suffers not Free-will to do anything, save to sin and be damned" (p. 347).

Such being the nature of Free-will—a downright lie, a name without reality, *nihil*—there being no power in man by which he can apply himself to these things that lead to salvation, we do not wonder that he then should say: "It is not irreligious, then, nor curious, nor superfluous, but highly salutary and necessary for a Christian to know whether the will does anything or nothing in those things that appertain to salvation. Yea, indeed, this is the hinge of our disputation, the question at issue turns on this. The object of our discussion is to inquire what Free-will is able to do, what it suffers, how it is related to the Grace of God. If we be ignorant of this then we shall know nothing at all about Christianity, then shall we be worse than the heathen" (p. 131).

The conclusion reached is that Free-will, that is, the human power, can contribute nothing toward our salvation, and can merit nothing from God, and cannot render it condign that God should bestow his favor upon men. Hence we are made entirely dependent on divine grace to begin, to continue and to complete, the work of salvation. This conclusion brings out the positive or real object of this entire discussion. It is exactly what Luther had taught for years in opposition to the Semi-Pelagianism, and to the doctrine of work-righteousness, held in the Roman Catholic Church. It was the revival of a distinct feature of Augustinianism, and is exactly what Luther taught in the Small Catechism four years later: "I believe that I cannot by my own reason and strength believe in, or come to Jesus Christ my Lord; but that the Holy Ghost has called me

by the Gospel, enlightened me through his gifts, sanctified and preserved me in the true faith"; and of Free-will it is taught in the eighteenth Article of the Confession: "Without the grace, assistance, and operation of the Holy Ghost, man is unable to become pleasing to God, or to fear God in heart, or to believe in him, or to cast innate evil out of his heart."

And as in the Catechism and Confession, so in the *De Servo Arbitrio*, the doctrine of Free-will is made the correlate of Free Grace, or rather of justification by faith alone, out of grace. For since man by his own powers can contribute absolutely nothing to "the word and work of God," it follows necessarily that his salvation must come from without. The *sola fide* has the *Servum Arbitrium* as its necessary preconception, for if Free-will can contribute anything, even the smallest particle, toward salvation, as Erasmus insisted, the *sola* would be excluded; and as proof of all this, Luther now, after quoting Rom. 3: 21-25, brings in Paul's five thunderbolts: That the righteousness of God is perfectly distinct from the righteousness of the law; that whatever is not of faith is sin; that all have sinned; that all have come short of the glory of God; that the justified are justified freely (pp. 338 *et seqq.*)—which are united in one vast thunderbolt and hurled at the asserters of Free-will: "By the testimony of their own conscience, then, we prove that Free-will, because it is destitute of the glory of God, is guilty, with all its powers, desires and efforts, of the perpetual crime of unbelief.

"But what will these defenders of Freedom say of what follows: 'justified freely by his grace.' What is this 'freely'? How are effort and merit to be reconciled with gratuitous and freely bestowed righteousness? Perhaps they will say that they contribute the least particle to merit, not even the merit of condignity. But these words are destitute of meaning. For the very object of this search after Free-will is to make room for merits. But if there be no freedom of the will, where is there room for merits? If there is no room for merits, where is there room for rewards? To whom is it imputed if any one be justified without merits?" (p. 341).

Finally the argument is brought down to an alternative: "Thus since Christ is called the way and the life, and that by way of comparison, so that whatever is not Christ is not the way, but out of the way, not the truth but a lie, not life but death, it must follow that Free-will, since it is not Christ nor in Christ, dwells in error, falsehood and death. Whose then is that middle substance, that power of Free-will, which since it is not Christ, (that is, the way, the truth, and life) still is not necessarily error, falsehood and death? * * * Choose then which you will. If you concede that the Scriptures speak by the way of comparison, you can say nothing of Free-will, except that those things that are contrary to Christ, namely, error, death and Satan, reign in it. If you do not concede that they speak by way of comparison, you enervate the Scriptures, and accomplish nothing, and so do not prove that Christ is necessary. And thus while you establish Free-will you make Christ of none effect, and trample all Scripture under foot" (p. 356).

The real purpose then of this treatise is to establish the doctrine of man's moral impotence in the matter of salvation, and his absolute need of divine grace. The doctrine of Predestination is only incidental, and is introduced as a support of the main argument. It is by no means the central thought and does not receive a hundredth part of the attention that is bestowed on Free-will. Moreover, it is connected with "the hidden God," who dwells in the mysterious adytum of his own isolation, and controls all things according to his secret will—a necessary object of thought, but not an object of faith, for faith must have a medium, a ladder by which it can come to God, and as this medium cannot be furnished by the *Lib-erum Arbitrium*, God himself must open a way of access. This he does by giving his Son to be the way, the truth and the life. God cannot become man without ceasing to be God; and man cannot become God without ceasing to be man. But Deity can unite himself with humanity in such a way as to manifest himself to the world, and thus can become "the proclaimed God," over against whom stands

IV. THE HUMAN VOLUNTAS.

The *voluntas* is something entirely different from the *Liberum Arbitrium*. It is that innate power of the soul by which choices are formed. The proper objects of its activity are phenomena. It owes no final allegiance to the postulates and hypotheses of the reason. It must have facts and positive data—a revelation, a *thus saith the Lord*. Here responsibility begins, and here is laid the foundation of faith. *Credo in Deum Patrem*. "The hidden God" may be believed, but he cannot be believed in. He cannot lay a positive injunction on the *voluntas*. By the very supposition he is *supramandane*. In physical nature and in the human soul there is revelation of the *Divine*. Hence the obligations of natural religion. In the Incarnation the revelation is complete. God in Christ sets himself forth evidently before men. Hence the obligations imposed by revealed religion, and the possibility of perfect trust.

This is clearly the position of Luther in the *De Servo Arbitrio*. "The proclaimed God" is made the only object of faith, and the freedom of the *voluntas* is insisted on. The former proposition has been already established. As regards the freedom of the *voluntas* Luther declares that man "acts *sponte et libenti voluntate*" (p. 156). "We act *volentes et lubentes* in accordance with the nature of the *voluntas*, which if it were forced, would not be *voluntas*; for coercion is (so to speak) rather *noluntas*" (p. 157); "he (Pharaoh) was not forced *nolens*, but by the natural operation of God he is carried to an act of willing naturally" (p. 262); "God does not work in us without us. He hath created and preserved us that he might work in us, and that we might coöperate with him" (p. 317).

And as to the responsibility of the *voluntas* in accepting or rejecting the offered salvation, Luther utters no uncertain sound: "Rightly therefore is it said: If God does not will death, it must be imputed to our will that we perish. Rightly, I say, if you speak of the proclaimed God, for he wills that all men be saved, inasmuch as by the word of salvation he comes to

all, and it is the fault of the *voluntas*, which does not admit him. How often would I have gathered thy children, but ye would not, Matt. 23" (p. 222-3). After quoting Colossians 2:3, he says: "Therefore the Incarnate God says here: *Volui et tu noluisti*. The Incarnate God, I say, was sent into the world that he might will, might speak, might do, might suffer, might offer for all men all things that are necessary unto salvation" (227-8).

These quotations show conclusively that Luther held no theory of particularistic election when he came to treat of "the proclaimed God," and of the word of God. The Incarnate God offers salvation to all men. The responsibility of accepting or rejecting the offer, rests with the hearer himself. When Luther comes to the appropriation of redemption, he enters the realm of the phenomenal, and inculcates the facts of experience. The *voluntas* is free—not free in the abstract or formal sense, since "neither God, nor Satan, allows a mere abstract power to will in us" (p. 199); "a pure dialectical figment" (*ibid.*)—but free in the material sense as over against a content of the good or of the bad. This *voluntas* is in a state of conscious activity, and not in a state of mere passivity. It both acts and suffers. It is laid hold of by divine grace, and lays hold of divine grace; so that every Christian has this antinomy in his own experience: He knows that God has given him faith, and he knows that he has believed on Christ. The two facts stand together harmoniously in the Christian experience, but they cannot be reconciled by the categories of science. They stand together, however, in such a way that faith, the subjective factor for the appropriation of salvation, a conscious personal act, is nevertheless referred back to divine grace. The appropriation of salvation and the application of the same are correlates. Divine grace is exclusive, but it is also inclusive. It excludes all merits, but it includes faith, and has no meaning except as it stands correlated to faith, and faith is impossible without the human *voluntas*. All this is involved in Luther's premises, since "God does not work in us without us" (p. 317); neither

is it contradicted by his own blessed experience: "But now, since God has taken my salvation away from my *arbitrium* and has received it with his own, and has promised to save me not by my own work and running, but by his grace and mercy, I am at ease and certain that he, since he is faithful, will not lie to me, and because he is powerful and great no devils and no adversities can overcome him, or can pluck me away from him" (p. 362-3). Salvation is wholly of grace, the human *arbitrium* can contribute nothing toward it; but when we speak of "the proclaimed God," "it must be imputed to our *voluntas* if we perish" (p. 222).

Thus have we analyzed this epoch-making book, and have exhibited its contents. We have found that its Determinism is incidental and collateral, not central and essential, and that its strong element of Predestination, which is correlated with "the hidden God," and is completely nullified by the emphasis laid on the proclaimed God," and on the divine word and by the complete vindication of the material freedom of the human *voluntas*. We have not sought to remove the paradoxes of the book, but to exhibit its chief purpose, which is to show that the salvation of man is taken completely out of his own hands, and is placed in the hand of God, who has made provision for the salvation of all. It is this its chief purpose that gives the book its perennial value, and that doubtless led Luther to say in 1537 that he did not wish it to be destroyed. It contains "the heart of the subject, the head of the cause," "the hinge of the matters in dispute" between Luther and his antagonists (p. 367). As against the Pelagianizing teaching of the times it sets forth the doctrine of salvation by grace more fully and elaborately than had hitherto been done, and brings out those views of "the proclaimed God," and of the means of grace which Luther magnifies as the years roll on.

But the book is a difficult one. Like him whom it seeks to glorify it is a sign to be spoken against. Not even Lutherans have agreed perfectly as to its real meaning. The theological Faculty of Rostock in 1595 declared that Luther spoke very

Calvinistically in this book. The great majority of the Dogmaticians, including such men as Chemnitz, Gerhard, Calovius and Loescher, have excused the predestinarianism of the book on the ground that the light of evangelical knowledge had not yet fully dawned on Luther. Some few have declared that there is nothing erroneous in the book, if only it be taken in Luther's sense. It is easy to justify all these views, for each expresses a part of the truth. But a very comprehensive view is that expressed by Dr. F. A. Philippi, of Rostock († 1882):

"The Reformation, which arose in opposition to the Romish Semi-Pelagianism, and did not proceed accidentally from the Order of Augustine, in the doctrine of sin and grace naturally went back to the correct principles of Augustinism, to the complete bondage of the will through sin, and to the alone-activity of divine grace in the work of conversion. At first the doctrine of Predestination fell comparatively into the back-ground. But when Erasmus in his book *De Libero Arbitrio* directed his attack upon the vital principle of the Reformation, and sought to bring the Church of God to reject the fundamental doctrine of the Reformation, and to return to the Romish Semi-Pelagianism, and in addition treated the absolute Predestination as a necessary consequence of the Augustinian doctrine of sin and grace, and held it up as a bugbear; then Luther, for the purpose of securing the evangelical basis of salvation, made a truly gigantic attack on this theological dwarf, in his book *De Servo Arbitrio*, and did not shrink from drawing also the inferences from his position, and accepted with an over-bold defiance of faith, on the one hand, from the premise of the bondage of the will, the theological deduction of an unconditional predestination; and on the other hand, from the premise of the unconditional omnipotence and eternal foreknowledge, the speculative conclusion of the bondage of the will. But Luther merely accepted the position offered him by his antagonist, and for the moment only allowed himself to be carried by opposition beyond the goal. In reality he sought rather to establish a basis than to draw a conclusion. And then both in his doctrine of justifi-

cation, and in the central position which it assumed for him, and in his doctrine of the means of grace, then already, and as time went on, more and more there was shown an irreconcilable opposition to the doctrine of absolute Predestination, whereby it was bound to be fully overcome. Therefore Luther not only never afterwards repeated this doctrine, but in reality taught the very opposite in his unequivocal proclamation of the universality of the divine grace, and of the all-sufficiency of the merits of Christ, and of the universal operation of the means of grace, and he even controverted this doctrine expressly as erroneous, and by his corrections took back his earlier utterances on this subject."*

Two things may yet be said: The Lutheran Church has not endorsed and adopted the doctrine of Predestination set forth in this book. More and more did Luther drift away from the predestinarian position taken in this book, and emphasized, the longer the name, "the proclaimed God," the offer of salvation to all men, and the potency of the means of grace.

Leaving the consideration of the former proposition for a future occasion, we proceed to establish the second one.

V. THE PROCLAIMED GOD AND THE MEANS OF GRACE.

In the Commentary on Galatians (1535) Luther lays it down as "a rule to be observed that men ought to abstain from curious searching of God's majesty," and says: "You have oftentimes heard of me how it is a rule and principle in the Scriptures diligently to be observed that we must abstain from curious searching of God's majesty, which is intolerable to man's body, and much more so to his mind." He says it is the Pope, the Turk, the Jew, who remove Christ out of sight and speak only of God. "But the true Christian theology (as I often warn) does not bring in God in his majesty, as Moses and other doctrines do, nor does it bid us pry into the nature of God, but to know his will as set forth in Christ, whom he would have

* *Glaubenslehre*, 2 ed., 4, 1, p. 37.

become incarnate, be born, die, on account of our sins, and that this should be preached to all nations. For seeing that the world by wisdom knew not God in wisdom, it pleased him by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe. Wherefore nothing is more perilous, when struggling with God against law, sin, death, than by our speculations to wander in heaven and contemplate God in his incomprehensible power, wisdom and majesty, as to how he created and governs the world. * * For as in his own nature God is incomprehensible and infinite, so is he intolerable to human nature. * * * Therefore begin where Christ began, namely, in the womb of the Virgin, in the manger, at his mother's breasts. For to this end he came down, was born, conversed with men, suffered, was crucified, died, that by all methods, he might set himself forth before our eyes, and fix upon himself the eyes of our hearts, that in this way he might keep us from ascending into heaven and from speculating about his majesty."*

Let us now see how carefully Luther observed his "rule." In 1528 he wrote to a person who was disturbed on the subject of election, as follows: "Though God knows all things, and though all works and thoughts in all creatures take place according to the decree of his will, yet it is his earnest will, purpose, intention and command, resolved on from eternity to save all men, and to make them partakers of everlasting joy, as is distinctly set forth in Eze. 18: 23, where it is said: *God wills not the death of the sinner, but that he should turn and live.* He wills to save sinners, living and moving everywhere under the wide high heavens. Do not by your foolish thoughts inspired by the devil, cut yourself off from the grace of God. For from the rising to the setting of the sun, from midday to midnight, he extends his grace, and overshadows all who turn and truly repent, and desire to be made partakers of his mercy: *For he is rich unto all who call upon him*, Rom. 10: 23. But to this corresponds a right, true faith, which expels fear and doubt as to what is our righteousness, as in Rom. 8: 22, it is written:

* *Comm. ad Gal. I, 46-9.* See English Translation, pp. 42 et seqq.

The righteousness through faith in Jesus Christ who is unto all and upon all. Mark these words: *in omnes, super omnes*, and see if you do not belong to the number of those embraced in the category of sinners."*

With like emphasis and to the same purpose Luther speaks in his *Lectures* on the CXXX Psalm (1531-3): "Often and gladly do I insist that outside of Christ you shut your eyes and ears, and say that you know no God except him who was on the bosom of Mary, and sucked her breasts. Where Jesus Christ is that God, there is God entire, there is the entire Trinity, there the Father and there the Holy Ghost are found. Apart from this Christ God is nowhere and is not found. I have known many monks, who, because they thought God could be apprehended by human speculations, fell into the greatest dangers; and had not God by special favor delivered me from the same temptation, I had rushed headlong into ruin. It is profitable for life to be made careful by the dangers of others.

"But though the prophet, as I have said, makes no distinct mention of the temple, yet you will see how he brings in the promise about Christ. For the argument of the Psalm is that there is no salvation, no grace, no righteousness, except in the God who remits sins and pardons. Is there any God except him who has said: 'The seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head?' Hence he means God the promissor, and thus shows the Christ who is promised by the Father to be a sacrifice for the sins of the world, and treats the principal subject, namely, that of the righteousness of Christ."†

In his *Commentary on Genesis* (1536-45) he writes: "The Jews also had representations by which God showed himself to them—the mercy-seat, the tabernacle, the pillars of cloud and fire, etc. 'No man shall see God and live,' as he says in Exodus (33: 20). Therefore he presents a picture of himself, for thus he shows himself to us, that we may be able to lay hold on him. In the New Testament we have baptism, the Lord's Supper, absolution and the ministry of the Word.

* *Briefe*, III, 355, 6.

† *Ex. Op. Lat.*, 20: 180.

"These are, as the Scholastics say, the *voluntas signi* (the revealed will), upon which we must look when we would know the will of God. The other is the *voluntas beneplaciti*, the substantial will of God, or the naked majesty which is God himself. From this the eyes must be removed; for it cannot be apprehended, since in God there is nothing but divinity, and the substance of God is his infinite wisdom and his infinite power. These are simply inaccessible to reason. What God willed by this *voluntas beneplaciti* he saw from eternity.

"We must not seek to inquire into this substantial and divine will, but must simply abstain from it, for it is inscrutable, and God does not wish to set it forth in this life. This he wishes to exhibit by means of certain institutions, as Baptism, the Word, the Sacrament of the Supper. These are the portraits of God, and the *voluntas signi*, through which God treats with us according to our understanding. Therefore we must look only upon these. The *voluntas beneplaciti* must be simply dismissed, unless there be a Moses or a David or some like perfect man, although even these looked upon the *voluntas beneplaciti* in such a way as never to turn their eyes from the *voluntas signi*.

"But the *voluntas signi* is the work of God when he comes to us outwardly, and treats with us through some sign, and through external things, which we can lay hold on, as the word of God and ceremonies instituted by himself. This *voluntas* we do not speak of as omnipotent, though by the Commandments God enjoins what he wills to be done, though it is not done. Thus Christ instituted the Supper that our confidence in mercy might be strengthened, though many receive it unto judgment, that is, without faith.

"But I return to Moses. He says, that God saw the wickedness of man and repented. This is explained by the Scholastics as follows: He sees and repents, namely, *voluntate signi non beneplaciti, sue substantiali voluntate*. We say that Noah's heart was moved by the Holy Ghost so that he knew that God was angry with man, and meant to destroy him. This explanation can be understood, and it does not carry us into those disquisitions about this absolute power or the majesty of God,

which are exceedingly perilous, as I have observed in the case of many persons. In the first place such spirits are inflated by the Devil, so as to think they have the Holy Ghost; and they neglect the word, yea, even blaspheme it and boast of nothing except the spirit and visions.

"This is the first step in the direction of error, when men, leaving the inclosed and incarnate God, run after the absolute God (*nudum Deum*). Afterwards when the hour of judgment comes, and they experience the anger of God, and God judges and tries their hearts, then the Devil ceases to support them. Hence they despair and die. For they walk in the open sun, and reject the shade that protects them from the heat (Isa. 4:6).

"Therefore let no one meditate on the abstract divinity, but flee such cogitations, as hell and as the veriest temptations of Satan. But let each one of us take care to abide by those signs, by which God himself reveals himself to us in his Son, born of the Virgin Mary, lying among the beasts in the manger, in the word, in Baptism, in the Lord's Supper, in absolution. For in these representations we see and find God, whom we can hear, who comforts us, gives us hope, and saves us. Other cogitations, those *de voluntate beneplaciti*, or those about the substantial and eternal will, kill and damn."*

Again: Writing about the election of eight persons to be saved in the ark, and of the subsequent "reprobation" of Ham, he says: "Here the Sophists dispute about election, which takes place according to the secret purpose of God. But I have often admonished that we must abstain from speculations about the absolute majesty; for as it is impossible that these should be true, so also are they by no means salutary. Rather must we think of God as he has offered himself to us in the word, and in the sacraments. Nor must we refer cases of this kind to the secret election, by which God arranges all things with himself from eternity. For this (secret election) we cannot

* *Ex. Op. Lat.*, II. 172 et seqq.

comprehend with the mind, and we see that it conflicts with the revealed will of God."*

Thus we see that in teaching and in preaching, Luther connects salvation *exclusively* with the *revealed* will of God, and repudiates "the secret election" of God as an empirical factor in man's salvation; he also refuses to know any will of God except the one that has been set forth in word and sacrament, which offer salvation to all. He even declares in this same connection that "they who pursue such sublime things about election according to the purpose of God, pervert souls and drive them to despair."

Also: "To these (Epicurean) thoughts we must oppose a true and firm knowledge of Christ, as I have often warned that it is in the highest sense useful and necessary that we have a sure knowledge of God, and that it be firmly grasped by our minds; otherwise our faith will be in vain. For if God stand not by his promise, then is it all over with our salvation. On the contrary, it is our comfort, that, though we fear, we flee for refuge to him who changes not, for so he declares in regard to himself: Malachi, 3: 6: 'I am God. I change not;' Rom. 11: 29: 'The gifts and calling of God.' Hence in the pamphlet *De Servo Arbitrio*, and elsewhere, I have shown that a distinction must be made when treating of the knowledge of God, or rather of the subject of Divinity. For we must discourse either about the hidden God, or about the proclaimed God. In regard to God, in so far as he is not revealed, there is no faith, no knowledge, no conception of God. Therefore we hold on to the proverb: *The things that are above us are not for us*. For the thoughts that explore what lies above and beyond the revelation of God, are absolutely diabolical, and serve chiefly to bring us headlong to ruin, because they present an object that is past finding out, namely, the unrevealed God. Rather therefore let God retain his decrees and mysteries in secret. There is no reason why we should try greatly to have them revealed to us."†

* *Ex. Op. Lat.*, 2: 205.

† *Ex. Op. Lat.*, 6: 292-3.

These quotations show the true Luther, and weigh as a hundred to one against the few references to Predestination that appear in his works. The emphasis is uniformly and persistently laid on "the proclaimed God," on God's earnest purpose to save all men, on the universal availability of the means of grace, and on man's responsibility with reference to the revealed will of God. We have not found a place in which Luther teaches that secret election is a doctrine of the Divine Word; or that men are warranted in putting their trust in "the hidden God" or in the secret purpose of God. On the contrary, he never wearies of insisting that all looking to "the hidden God" and his secret election, utterly invalidates the means of grace and renders faith impossible, since faith must attach itself to a sign, to a promise, to the revealed God.

And so deeply have these thoughts and principles become imbedded in the very heart of Luther's conception of the way of salvation, that they return for the thousandth time, and consequently render the doctrine of absolute Predestination and secret election *ex beneplacito Dei* impossible for him as a working factor in the economy of redemption. It is true that he cannot always be reconciled with himself; as for instance, when he says: "Though God knows all things, and though all works and thoughts in all creatures must occur according to the decree of his will, yet it is his earnest will, purpose and command, resolved on from eternity, to save all men and make them partakers of eternal joy." We are concerned only with the fact, and we have yet to find a single passage in which Luther ever called Predestination "the article of a standing or falling church;" or "the head and corner-stone which alone begets, nourishes, edifies, preserves and defends the Church, and without which the Church could not exist a single hour," or declared that out of Predestination "flow all other doctrines," or that it "is the sum of the entire Christian doctrine." Luther wrote no dissertation on Predestination, and has left us no sermons on the subject. He did not say a word about it in his Greater Confession, nor in the Schmalkald Articles. But justification by faith alone formed the very warp and woof of all that he preached

and wrote, so that if we should abstract from his sermons, and from his writings, all that he preached and wrote on that subject, the remainder would be an unintelligible jargon, and would exhibit their author as a man destitute of a definite idea about salvation, and would utterly fail to furnish a principle for the Lutheran Reformation, or a motive for the most important evangelical work since the days of the great Apostle to the Gentiles.

Indeed we do not see how it would have been possible for Luther to exalt this doctrine more than he did. Hear him once more in his own words. *Articulus iustificationis est magister et princeps, dominus, rector et iudex super omnia genera doctrinarum, qui conservat et gubernat omnem doctrinam ecclesiasticam et erigit conscientiam nostram coram Deo. Sine hoc articulo mundus et plane mors et tenebrae. Quia nullus est error tam parvus, tam ineptus et insultus, qui non summe placeat rationi humanae et nos seducat, si sine cognitione et meditatione huius articuli sumus. Ideo quia mundus ita crassus est et haebes, necessarium est hunc articulum saepissime tractare et habere maxime cognitum, praesertim si ecclesiis voverimus consulare. Nihil mali timebimus, si sic in articulo isto discendo plurimum operis ac diligenter posuerimus, plurimum laboraverimus. Quia animus stabilitus et firmatus hac certa cognitione potest in omnibus aliis articulis persistere. Ergo res non est parva et inanis, sed gravis, praesertim his, qui volunt stare in acie et pugnare contra diabolum, peccatum et mortem, et docere ecclesias.**

With such antecedents, it is not a matter of wonder that standard Lutheran teachers speak of Justification as "the eternal principle of Christianity;" "the chief doctrine of our Church;" "the material principle," and affirm that no other Church holds that doctrine as the Lutheran Church does, that is, has made it the genetic principle of its system of doctrine, and has sought to reconcile every other doctrine with this principle. As Luther found life and salvation by free justification, and

* *Drews Luther's Disputationen*, p. 119.

learned of free justification through the word, so he came to know God not as "the hidden God," but as "the God clothed in and proclaimed by his word." The Augustinian inculcation of Predestination remained in his head as a reminiscence, but the Pauline principle of justification reigned and ruled in his heart as an experience. Indeed there were two men in Luther. There was the disciple of Augustine, and there was the disciple of Paul. Not infrequently these two were opposed each to the other. The disciple of Augustine never ceased to contend against the disciple of Paul. But evermore did the disciple of Paul triumph, and as Luther grew older, and searched deeper into the divine word, and learned more of *Christus hujus justitie fons et origo*,* the disciple of Augustine grew dumb, and the disciple of Paul exclaimed: "In my heart this article reigns, even the faith of Christ, from whom, by whom and unto whom my divine studies, day and night, have recourse to and fro continually, for if this article be lost, then is also the doctrine of truth, life, and salvation lost and gone."†

And as proof that as Luther grew older the doctrine of Justification, and of Christ "the almighty, eternal God," did reign and rule in his heart, and that Predestination fell completely into the back-ground, and that he enunciated in clearest terms the universality of the divine offer of salvation, we point to the following passages:

1. In his sermon on Matt. 20:1-16, anno 1534, when he comes to the words: *Many be called, but few are chosen* he says: "Over-curious heads draw many absurd and ungodly conclusions from this passage" and explain the words thus: "Many are called," etc. That is, God offers his grace to many but 'few are chosen,' which means, But he bestows his grace upon few. These imagine that when God has chosen anyone he will be saved without means. But he who has not been called, may do what he will, he may be as pious and believing as he will, yet it is still so ordered by God, that he must fall and cannot be saved. But let him who would know God and

* Jena Ed., IV., f. 643b.

† Preface to Galatians.

do his will, go the right way, then he will not be offended, but bettered. But the right way is the Lord Christ. But how does it go? As we are afterwards told in the Gospel, Few are chosen, that is, few so conduct themselves according to the Gospel, that God is pleased with them. * * * *Many are called*, that is, God offers his grace to many, but few are chosen, that is, he bestows his grace on few, because few are to be saved. But this is, indeed, a godless interpretation * * * a diabolical slander. * * * They are elected and please God who diligently hear the gospel, believe on Christ, prove their faith by good works, and suffer what they shall be called on to suffer."*

The plain object of this comment is to turn the mind away from the secret counsel of God, and to fix it on the gospel, and on Christ, and to make Christ the *prius* in the matter of election. They are elected who believe on Christ, which is very different from saying that they believe on Christ who are elected.

2. In the *Disputationen Dr. Martin Luthers*, published by Dr. Paul Drews in 1895, we have a remarkable representation of Luther's mind and thoughts from 1535 to 1545. In this splendid volume of 999 octavo pages containing scores upon scores of theses and propositions discussed by Luther, the word *Electio* is not used in a single instance in reference to salvation. In only one instance is the word *Praedestinatio* used, and then it is declared that "an account of Predestination is not to be rendered" (pp. 188-9); and when the verbal form is used, it is said that "we are called, elected and predestinated on account of Christ, the Beloved, and remain the beloved of God. This is the revealed will that comforts and cheers our consciences" (p. 191).

In these *Disputations* stress is laid on the universality of redemption, and it is said expressly "that God wills that all men should be saved, without a single exception. * * * But, that all men are not saved, not God, but man is the cause" (p. 723). And in the margin we read as follows: "The knowl-

**Erl. Ed.*, I: 104-6.

edge of repentance and faith is universal. Hence the Church is not isolated and composed of a few persons, because God wills that all men be saved [1 Tim. 2 : 4], therefore not certain ones.

"Response. In the revealed word he wills that all be saved, and if they believe that word, they shall be saved."

3. In commenting on Genesis 26: 9, he "takes occasion to treat of doubt, of God and of the will of God." The speeches of those who say: "If I am predestinated, do as I may, I shall be saved; if I am not predestinated, I shall be damned," etc., he calls "the poisoned darts of the devil, original sin," "deceptions of the devil," that bring "despair, contempt of God, of the Sacred Scriptures, of Baptism, and of all the divine blessings by which God means to fortify us against uncertainty and doubt." Then, after urging his hearers to leave "the hidden God," and to know "the proclaimed God," through Jesus Christ, the word, the sacraments, the ministry, all "which are bodily things, corporeal signs by which God reveals himself," he says: "These things have I desired thus carefully and accurately to exhort and to teach because after my death many will quote my books and from these corroborate their own errors and dreams of every kind. I have written among other things, that all things are absolute and necessary; but at the same time I have added that we must look upon the revealed God, as we sing in the Psalm; He is called Jesus Christ, the Lord Sabaoth, and there is no other God; Jesus Christ is Lord Sabaoth, nor is there any other God, etc. But all these passages they will omit, and will seize only those about the hidden God. Therefore you who now hear me, are to remember that I have taught that we are not to inquire about the predestination of the hidden God; but that we are to rest in that which is revealed through vocation, and through the ministry of the word. There thou canst be certain of thy faith and salvation, and canst say: I believe in the Son of God, who hath said: 'Whoso believeth in the Son hath eternal life' (John 3 : 36). Therefore in him there is no condemnation, nor wrath, but the good will of God the Father. These things I have protested elsewhere also in my books, and

now I present them *viva voce*. Therefore I am without blame."*

This is not indeed a formal retraction of the *De Servo Arbitrio*, but it is a limitation and a qualification of what he wrote in that treatise, and a placing of the emphasis on the things that directly and immediately concern our salvation, viz., the revealed God, Christ, the means of grace. Hence this excursus on Genesis 26: 9 shows to a demonstration that Luther did not have any practical interest in the eternal predestination and secret election of God, except as they come in *after* Christ and *after* faith, to assure us that God will keep his promises. And this use of Predestination, or, rather, of the eternal fore-knowledge of God, had already in 1522 been brought to high relief by Luther in his Preface to the Epistle to the Romans. He finds the order of the Epistle, which is also the order of salvation, to be as follows: *sin, grace, faith, righteousness, flesh and spirit*, and declares that "chapters 6, 7, 8 urge us to persevere in the work of faith." He does not in any sense connect Predestination with verses 29 and 30 of chap. 8. On the contrary he says: "Let us strive against sin, as we have learned in chaps. 1-8. After that we have come into chap. 8, which reminds us of the crosses and sufferings incident to our lives, we will find great comfort in the thought of God's foreknowledge as explained in chaps. 9, 10, 11."

His meaning is that we must "first of all concern ourselves about Christ, and learn from the Gospel that we are all sinners and need the grace of God," and that we must exercise faith in the Gospel. Then under the cross it is a comfort to know that our salvation is taken out of our own hands and is in the hands of God. Thus "every doctrine has a nature of its own, and must be received in due form, time and age." Babies must not "drink the strong wine," and the unregenerate "cannot think of the foreknowledge of God without harboring bitter resentment against him."

Returning, now, to the Commentary on Genesis, and to the

* *Op. Lat.* 6, pp. 290-300.

later writings generally, we find that Luther constantly urges men to cleave to the revealed God by a firm faith, and he assures them that if they believe on the revealed God and receive his word, the hidden God will be gradually made known; but if they reject the Son, they will with the revealed God, lose also the God not revealed.* And in this same connection he declares that "thoughts or doubts *de praedestinatione* are not a matter of indifference, but are impious, wicked, and diabolical" (p. 297).

Here we bring the first part of our dissertation to a close. We have followed Luther along certain lines during the last twenty years of his life—during the period in which the Lutheran Church was born, grew, and waxed great in the land of its birth. We have not thought to defend a thesis, but to bring out the facts touching Luther's relations to the *primordia* of the Christian scheme. We have seen that when standing in the presence of "the proclaimed God," and of the *voluntas signi*, he says *not one word* in defense of the absolute Predestination and secret Election of God, as conditioning or determining the way of salvation. On the contrary he declares that men are saved and predestinated on account of Christ, and that it is the earnest will, purpose, command of God, resolved on from eternity, to save all men, and to make them partakers of eternal happiness. In these years he increases the emphasis on "the proclaimed God," on Jesus Christ, on the means of grace, on the *sola fide*, and on the all-dominating and all-embracing character of the article of Justification, which article he holds not as an abstract principle, or as a dogma for the understanding, but as a living experience of salvation. Hence this article gave shape to his conception of God, and to the means by which God applies and man appropriates the proffered redemption. Luther's God was the Father, the Source of Redemption, the Son, the Purchaser of Redemption (*propter Christum*), the Spirit the Applier of Redemption through the word of truth. Predestination belongs to the secret will of God, and was post-

* *Op. Lat.*, 6, p. 295.

poned and subordinated, the longer the more, to Justification, and did not at any time enter genetically, centrally, determinatively into his "divine studies." And thus, as not being primary, and as not being a teaching of the divine word, it had necessarily to give way before the emphasis that with increasing energy Luther laid on the means of grace, which offer salvation to all men—in *omnes, super omnes*—without partiality, and convey salvation to all who believe. Election must be sought, not in the *secret* counsel of God, or apart from Christ, but *in the Gospel*, and *in Christ*, "who came into the world, that he might will, might speak, might do, might suffer, might offer, for all men, all things that are necessary to salvation."

(TO BE CONTINUED.)

ARTICLE III.

ALCOHOL.

BY REV. R. H. CLARE.

The present agitation of the alcoholic liquor question in Germany may rightly be regarded as one of the most significant and hopeful signs of the times. When we take into consideration the proportions which this movement in favor of temperance, and, indeed, of total prohibition, has assumed, those of us who have always considered German scholarship and German practice generally, as wedded to the custom of moderate drinking, can hardly understand what has taken place to give the temperance movement such an impetus in so short a time. We notice among the principal agitators of the movement towards thorough temperance reform the names of leading scientists, medical directors of hospitals, professors of universities, colleges and academies, those connected with asylums and prisons, and others, whose duty and calling prompt to make a close study of social pathological conditions. Startled at last, by the havoc wrought by alcoholic drinks, as revealed

by observation, and by statistics, these men of science have undertaken the work of investigating, by scientific methods, the causes of poverty and crime, insanity and suicide, and to alter, if possible, a condition which is sapping the life of the nation, and which to their minds has become intolerable. A strong and aggressive movement has begun in favor of the suppression of the existing drink customs, and against the use of every kind of alcoholic liquors. It is a matter of fact that the present movement is not to any great extent in the hands of the clergy, or of the churches. There are pastors, many of them, engaged in the war against established drink customs, but they are not the leaders in the movement which is now on. The agitation is principally in the hands of science, and the appeal is based on the appalling facts, easily recognized by the investigator, as to the havoc wrought by alcohol. It is somewhat difficult to trace the beginnings of this movement. In 1878 Dr. A. Baer, member of the Royal Sanitary Commission, and Chief Physician to the Penitentiary of Ploetzenser, near Berlin, published a book entitled "Alcohol, its Distribution, and its Effect on the Individual Organism," which at the time attracted considerable attention. The work was, however, too large for general distribution, and its exhaustive scientific method of treatment made it of real value only to a limited number of readers. This may, however, after all, have been a real advantage to the cause of temperance, as the work merited and received the attention of scientists, and indicated new lines for scientific investigations. In a later work (1890), the author discusses the question of "Alcohol in its relation to mortality, mental disorders and crime."

Since these publications, and a number of others on the same general subject, there have been organized in Germany, France and Switzerland, a number of societies for the restriction and suppression of the drinking habits, and the traffic in alcohol. At the head of these societies, or actively connected with them, are some of the leading scientists of Germany and Switzerland. Dr. Kraepelin, of the Heidelberg University, is president of the "Total Abstinence Association of German-

speaking Lands," and with him is associated the venerable Prof. Max Von Pettenkofer, of Munich. Director E. Blocher, of Basel, Bishop Augustin Egger, of St. Galle, and others, are actively engaged in the temperance work of these societies.

With the organization of these societies there has also appeared an extensive temperance literature. The question is discussed in tracts and pamphlets; in trade and scientific journals, and the medical journals especially, are devoting large space to its consideration.

Among recent publications we notice the exhaustive work of Hugo Hoppe, M.D., Neurologist, Director of the Provincial Institution for the Insane, Allenberg, Prussia: *Facts Concerning Alcohol*. The first edition of this book was quickly exhausted, and a second edition with the addition of copious statistical tables was prepared—probably the most exhaustive work of its kind ever published. In this volume of nearly four hundred pages the author not only gives us his own researches and conclusions, but besides, the testimony of authorities in the various departments of science, against the use of alcohol as a beverage. It is a work of strict scientific inquiry and investigation, to determine with exactness the origin, nature, physiological effect, and therapeutic uses of alcohol; its effects and influences upon the living human organism in health and disease; upon the varied conditions of social and domestic life; of morals and education; of progress and prosperity; of degradation and crime.

It is this book which has suggested the present article. It will not be possible in the space allotted us, to include statistical tables, or to indicate with minuteness the methods of scientific research, but we hope to be able to show conclusively, that the subject under consideration merits the painstaking and prayerful consideration of every Christian American citizen.

The process by which alcohol is developed is now quite well understood. If starch be moistened with water, in which a little ferment, as yeast, has been introduced, and subjected to a temperature of one hundred degrees of heat, it will change to

grape sugar. If the temperature be maintained in the presence of the ferment, it will be decomposed, and its elements separated with carbonic anhydride and alcohol. The gas speedily escapes, and the alcohol remains dissolved in the water. Distillation separates this from the principal part of the water; the remainder may be removed by certain chemical processes, and absolute alcohol obtained. Alcohol is therefore not a product of distillation as supposed by some, but a product of fermentation, the distillation only separating the alcohol obtained by fermentation from other substances. Alcohol is a powerful solvent, readily dissolving most of the resinous gums and vegetable extracts. Chemically considered, alcohol is composed of three gasses in the following proportions. Carbon 51.88 per cent., Hydrogen 13.70 per cent. and Oxygen 34.42 per cent. The amount of alcohol contained in the various kinds of drinks varies with the different classes and kinds of liquors, the distilled liquors containing from 73.70 in Irish whiskey, down to 51.60 in common gin, and in the fermented drinks from about 23 per cent. in port wine, to $1\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. in small beer. All these drinks owe their toxic properties to the one ingredient—alcohol. In the one class the alcohol is generated by fermentation, and in the other by a process of purification of the ferment by distillation. In all cases the alcohol is generated by sugar decomposition induced by the yeast fungus in a proper temperature.

Dr. Hoppe considers the process analagous to that which takes place in the decomposition of albumen, caused by bacterial life, or pathogenic bacteria. In other words, the alcohol is an effete toxic product resulting from a micro-organism on sugar or glucose, and is not found as a proximate element in living organized bodies, whether animal or vegetable. Its composition entitles it to be classed with the pure carbo-hydrates, and unfortunately it has often been classed with those pure carbo-hydrates resulting from vegetable growth or nutrition—starch, gum, cellulose or supporters of combustion, or respiratory food, when taken into the human system. Such conclusions were not arrived at, however, because of the similarity of

action produced by these several substances when taken into the system, but solely on the fact of their being composed of the same ultimate elements—carbon, hydrogen and oxygen, in proportions to admit of further oxydation outside of the living body. The clear and important distinction between such carbohydrates as starch, sugar, gum, cellulose and dextrine, resulting from vegetable and animal nutrition, and the alcohols, which result solely from retrograde metamorphosis or bacteriological excretion usually termed fermentation, was manifestly overlooked. Briefly stated, the alcohol ferment, or yeast, is a minute cellular plant, which grows rapidly in sugar solution, and alcohol is the product of the sugar decomposition. This decomposition is analogous to that which takes place in albumen decomposition caused by pathogenic bacteria, which enter into the animal tissue, subtract nourishment from the same, and leave behind waste matter. This waste matter, enters, through the blood, into the cells and tissues of the body, and thus gives rise to fevers and other disease manifestations. It is interesting to note that in the fermentative process of the yeast fungus, there are limitations set to the fungus life. When a certain amount of alcohol has been produced in the process of growth, that growth is arrested. That is, the activity of the yeast fermentation ceases, and the fungus dies in its own product, a process peculiar to micro-organisms, and a knowledge of which peculiarity is now made use of in the treatment of certain infectious diseases. Alcohol is therefore a deadly poison to its own originator, the yeast fungus. That it arrests and destroys other organic life is well known, as it is extensively employed on account of its anti-ferment or antiseptic properties. The deleterious effects of alcohol have heretofore been largely attributed to the fusil oil it contains, and laws have been enacted in various countries to restrict the sale of liquors containing fusil oil in what was supposed to be unhygienic quantities. Recent experiments however seem to indicate that these effects are to be attributed to the alcohol alone. Prof. Strassman says: "Experiments in the clinic, and on animals, lead us to conclude that the more harmful effect of a liquor containing from

0.3-0.5 per cent. of fusil oil, as over against a pure spirit, has not been proven, but the deleterious effects must be attributed to the alcohol itself."

As to the physiological effect of alcohol, when taken into the animal organism, it must be recognized and has been abundantly proven to act always as a poison, and always disturbs, and in certain concentrations completely arrests the life-processes. According to Hodge (1897) the growth of the yeast-cell is arrested by the addition of 1-1000 per cent. of alcohol (2 drops in 4 quarts approx.), and further additions accentuate the retardation until the complete arrest of growth at 14 per cent.

The life process of Algae and similar growths ceases in an infusion of 4 per cent. Ridge noticed the death of the water flea (*Daphnia*) in a solution of 1-20,000. Dr. Overton of Zurich, in experimenting on the effect of alcohol on plant cells found, that while these cells have more or less power to exclude other injurious substances, alcohol readily passes through the walls of the cells and destroys their protoplasm. He also observes that "when different cells are brought under the influence of alcohol in different solutions or concentrations, the finest and most complicated parts of the plant organism are those first arrested in their activity, and then the others, in regular order to the most simple or course."

In like manner does alcohol affect the animal organism. It is diffused through the system. It enters the cell walls and arrests protoplasmic activity. When taken into the stomach even in small quantities it excites the glands, and increases the secretions. If the ordinary ethylic alcohol is taken into the living stomach undiluted and pure, it acts directly on the tissues with which it comes in contact as a destructive, corrosive poison. If taken in the form of fermented or distilled drinks, largely diluted, it is readily diffused, imbibed by the glands, and carried by the blood into every organ and tissue of the body. More or less of it again appears in the excretory secretions and eliminations of the lungs, kidneys, bowels, skin, etc., as a foreign non-assimilable substance.

These statements are confirmed by the direct experimental investigations of distinguished physiologists and physicians, such as Drs. Boecker, Aiken, Lankester, F.R.S., Virchow, Richardson, Prout, Harley, Ringer, Branston, Kraeplin, Kurtz, Hoppe and others, many of whom claim that no digestion of alcohol really takes place in the stomach, but that it is absorbed by the blood-vessels and thus sent on its circuit of destruction, that it does not directly assist digestion, and can not from its nature do so; and any benefit derived from it at all, must come from reflex action after the brain and nerves have been affected by it.

Dr. Aitken in his "Practice of Medicine," says: "When spirituous liquors are taken into the stomach, they tend, in the first place, to coagulate all the albuminous articles of food or fluid with which they come in contact. As an irritant, they stimulate the glandular secretions from the mucous membrane, and ultimately lead to permanent congestion of the vessels, and to thickening of the gastric tissues." A bumper of beer, containing from $1\frac{1}{2}$ to 3 fl. drams of absolute alcohol, will necessarily retard digestion in a healthy stomach. Prof. Baer mentions a case of syringotomy, where the process of digestion could be observed, and in which there was a marked retardation of stomachic digestion after the administration of 3 ccm absolute alcohol ($\frac{3}{4}$ dram *approx.*) in 170 ccm water ($4\frac{1}{2}$ drams *approx.*)

Prof. Hoppe claims that even very small quantities of alcohol depreciate the value of food as nutriment, and Dr. Bunge claims that the nutritive value of vegetable food especially suffers loss.

When alcohol is taken into the stomach it is quickly absorbed by the blood vessels and enters the circulation. Its effects upon the blood itself, according to Drs. Berkley and Friedenwald (1897), is to check the movements of the white blood-corpuscles and to cause shrinkage of the red blood-corpuscles and a reduction of haemoglobin. The experiments of Dr. Boecker lead him to say: "Alcohol poisons the blood, arrests the development, and hastens the decay of the red blood-

corpuscles." This view is sustained by Dr. Virchow and others. The extensive experiments of Dr. W. Evelyn, of San Francisco, confirm this view. He administered alcohol to horses in varying quantities and at different times, and noted a change in the blood substance. The red blood-corpuscles became granulated, of a darker color, and shrunken. The white corpuscles showed signs of disintegration. The serum became colorless in comparison with that of animals in normal condition, and the blood pigment showed signs of dissolution. According to Biel the sugar-forming (fermentation) power of the blood is lowered, more or less, according to the length of time and quantity of alcohol consumed. According to Dogel the blood of an animal under alcoholic stimulation coagulates more slowly and contains less fibrin than that of one in normal condition.

The blood and lymphatics conduct the alcohol to the different parts of the body, and, as we have seen in the case of plants and their cells, the finer and most complicated parts are those first affected. The brain, the seat of mental activity, is the first to suffer loss, as is evident from universal observation. A small quantity of alcohol often is sufficient to change man in his whole being and nature. It is this exciting effect upon the brain that makes man seemingly cheerful, lively, careless, reckless and witty that has helped King Alcohol in his victorious onward march among the sons of men. The associated narcotic effect must also be taken account of, which enables men to forget their sorrows, and which is often sought to quiet a disturbed conscience.

But what is the testimony of science as to the effect of alcohol on mental activity? Dr. Helmholtz, in an address delivered on the occasion of the Helmholtz Jubilee, Nov. 2, 1891, among other things, said: "Having, in the pursuit of my labors often found myself in the unpleasant predicament of a halt for favorable ideas, my experience as to the when and where of their coming, may be of some value to others. They often steal into the range of thought when at first we do not realize their meaning and significance. At other times they

come suddenly, without effort like an inspiration. According to my experience they never come to a tired brain, nor at the desk. It was necessary for me to examine my problem in all its bearings and from all sides, and to explore all its intricacies and windings without the use of a pen. Then, after the fatigue had passed off, I would need an hour of bodily freshness and relaxation, when ideas would be formulated. A climb over wooded hills in sunny weather acted most favorably. The smallest quantity of alcoholic drink seemed to dispel them."

August Forell, Prof. of mental diseases, Zurich, says: "As for the mental faculties, alcohol paralyses, first and most effectually, what is highest, most complicated and finally, what we call ethical and aesthetic perceptions, the conscience and reason."

If then, alcohol hinders and prevents the exercise of the highest mental activities, what must be its effects in the mental processes of the ordinary life. Dr. Kraepelin, Prof. of Psychiatry, Heidelberg, 1892, instituted a series of investigations to ascertain the effect of alcohol on the sensory and motor nerves of a class of young men, students and assistants. The tests covered a wide range, and consisted in part of the exact tests of the sense of touch after given signals, time tests, prelection, solving mathematical problems, spatial relations, and other tests of sense perception. These tests were made under normal and alcoholic conditions. It was found that even small quantities of alcohol—4 to 5 drams—weakened normal powers and functions, and that recovery to the normal in many instances, was not attained for several hours. In some instances he records an acceleration of motion and sense perception at the first and for a very brief period, to be followed however by relapse far below the normal. In the motor tests, what for a short time seemed to have been gained in acceleration, was more than overbalanced by want of exactness. In the purely mental tests the thought processes became clouded, and a tendency to verbosity manifested itself—wordiness without contents. Prof. Kraepelin sums up the results of his experiments as follows: "The composite picture obtained by these experiments is one readily recognized. The various lines in its trac-

ings are those we are familiar with in everyday life. Our tests but modestly indicate that which we have seen in its brutal perfection in the completer forms of acute alcoholic poisoning. The deteriorated capability of comprehension in the tests correspond with the inability of the drunkard to adjust himself to his environment—to find his way. The difficulty experienced in an attempt to excite his attention, and the stupefaction of his mental powers even to complete insensibility. In the weakened ability to judge in regard to associated transactions and occurrences, is manifested the veiling and sinking of the intellectual powers. The inability to make or to comprehend detailed statements; to judge of his own or another's mental productions or processes; the want of clear reflection as to the effect of his own words and deeds; the tendency to trivial or stereotyped words and phrases, and silly witticism; the qualitative changes of associations; all these indicate the shallowness of the thought processes. The accentuated motory reaction is the cause of the feeling of increased strength, but also the cause of all the thoughtless, objectless, impulsive and violent acts, which have given renown to alcohol, not only in the records of foolish and supercilious pranks, but also in the annals of violent acts of passion. To this must also be attributed the manifest want of a company under the effects of alcohol to resist the tendency to become noisy; to sing and laugh immoderately, as well as the tendency to set aside those psychic checks known to us as timidity and embarrassment; all those considerations which under other circumstances in human intercourse govern acts and speech with minutest exactness. The tendency is to become nettled, unrestrained, regardless of others. The imbibor is inclined to babble out his secrets, revealing the most sacred emotions of his soul without constraint to those altogether indifferent and unconcerned."

The effects of a single potion of 80 gm. ($2\frac{1}{2}$ ounces aprox.) of alcohol may be noticed even after the lapse of from 24 to 36 hours, and if the dose be repeated before the effects of the first have passed away, a cumulative effect is produced, denoting the first stages of chronic alcoholism. If the daily use of such a quantity as to produce cumulative effect be indulged in

for a week or two, decided injury will have been sustained and if the drinker be a laborer, his labor-value will have sustained a loss of from 25 to 40 per cent. This reduced labor-value may not be so apparent in the physical and mental activities of ordinary daily life, but there will manifest itself a decided loss of creative skill; a loss of tact and preciseness, and an incurable disability in the performance of tasks of great difficulty and responsibility. And, even after the cutting off of the supply of alcohol after such a debauch it will be a difficult and wearisome, and it may be impossible, task to recover the former normal condition. A permanent injury has been sustained. A susceptibility to alcoholic effect will follow the imbibitor a long time after, and possibly he can never recover his former self. The effects of alcohol in this respect are somewhat similar to those of morphia.

As to the effect of alcohol upon the muscles and nerves, Dr. J. Ridge, of London, found that 4 to 8 ccm. of alcohol (1 to 2 drams approx.) blunted materially the sense of touch, of hearing and of sight, or vision, and Dr. Kremer, *Experiments with Narcotics*, noticed a material reduction of skin-sensibility after the administration of 60 gm. of old Cognac (1 1/4 drams absolute alcohol). Prof. Hoppe calls attention to the effect of alcohol on the vaso-constrictors—nerves whose office it is to constrict the blood vessels. These become relaxed, and the face, particularly the nose, of the alcoholic becomes red or blue-red, a condition often noticed. The enlarging of these blood-vessels has a deleterious effect upon the heart on account of decreased blood pressure.

Dr. Horatio C. Wood (1890), in speaking of the stimulating effects of alcohol, which in all cases he considers but temporary, mentions a case of chloroform narcosis where recourse was had to alcohol on account of its stimulating effects, and he noticed "a rapid decline of the pulse, and of arterial pressure."

When alcohol is taken in small quantities respiration is at first accelerated, but to be retarded below the normal after a time. In large doses it is quickened for a time, but becomes superficial, and may, by increased doses, be arrested altogether. Recent investigations seem to point to a hunger for oxygen as

the cause of quickened respiration. The alcohol is rapidly oxydized in the body, and carbonic acid is produced, which in time is eliminated from the system by the skin, kidneys and lungs. This amount of elimination has been differently estimated by pathologists—according to Strassman, 10 per cent. and Bodlander, 5 per cent. When alcohol is used there is a greater consumption of oxygen, and hence the effort of the lungs to supply the induced insufficiency by increased, or accelerated respiration. But as the supply even then is inadequate to the want created, a draft is made upon the tissues of the body, which readily yield their supply to the poison, thus retarding the digestion of nutriment in the stomach and bowels. And as the poison also extracts the oxygen from the blood corpuscles and eliminates carbonic acid, we can explain in a measure the loss of appetite and the accumulation of fat deposits. Schmidt speaks of a poisoning by the retention of carbonic acid on account of insufficient elimination, induced by superficial respiration.

This leads us to another very important and interesting phase of the alcohol question: That of its supposed food value. If alcohol destroys protoplasm, and acts as a corrosive poison on the mucus membrane of the stomach when taken in sufficient quantities; if it hinders and retards mental activity, can it when administered in any form or quantity assist in building up waste tissue? or in other words, is alcohol a food? The arguments in the affirmative have been based on several considerations. 1. It has been quite generally considered as true that if alcohol be taken at regular and frequent intervals, the weight of the body is increased. 2. All forms of food substances may be arranged in two general classes, viz.: nitrogenous and carbonaceous. And as alcohol contains so large a proportion of carbon, it was assigned a conspicuous place in the list of respiratory food substances. The first point in the argument we have already considered in part. We know that the process of living and dying, or of composition and decomposition, is going on in all parts of the human system from birth till death. When a particle of matter has served its pur-

pose in the human system it loses its power further to serve that system, and its further presence is detrimental to health. A healthy body will throw off this waste matter. If, however, alcohol, the tendency of which is to antagonize the natural tendency to decomposition, be taken into the body, there necessarily must be a retention of effete matter. Its action on the nutriment in the stomach and bowels; on the blood and serum; on the respiratory organs—all lead us to believe that the increased weight of the body after the use of alcohol can be accounted for on the supposition that the retained effete matter has given to the body the additional weight. As to the second point in the argument, we would say, that the mistake of Baron Liebig, early in the progress of analytical and organic chemistry, in assigning to alcohol the functions and powers of a pure carbo-hydrate was, that he seems not to have recognized the distinction recognized to-day by most scientists between those carbo-hydrates resulting from vegetable growth or nutrition, starch, gum, sugar, cellulose, or supporters of combustion, or respiratory foods when taken into the human system, and the alcohols which result from retrograde metamorphosis or bacteriological excretion, usually termed fermentation. The first class of carbo-hydrates named, starch, sugar, cellulose, gum, undergo such digestion and assimilation or molecular changes that their identity is lost in the blood and tissue of the healthy animal body, and their products produce no degenerative or unnatural excitement or disturbance in any of the functions or processes of the otherwise healthy body. Their use creates no craving or morbid appetite, and if taken in excess the superabundance is readily rejected with the ordinary faecal matter of the intestines. But alcohol as a carbo-hydrate of the second class undergoes no such change when taken into the stomach or digestive apparatus. Undiluted it acts as a corrosive poison upon the tissues, and when diluted, as in the case of fermented or distilled drinks, it is readily absorbed into the blood, and forwarded with it to every tissue and organ of the body. This has been proven by hundreds of experiments. And then, more or less of it appears again in the excretory secretions,

and eliminations of the lungs, skin and kidneys like other foreign non-assimilable substances and materials. There can therefore be no true similarity, pathological or histological, between these two named carbo-hydrates. If another supposition be considered, one which is urged sometimes in favor of alcohol as a food substance, it will be found to rest on an equally untenable assumption. It is this, viz.: Alcohol supplies by its oxydation, energy to the organism, for its activity and heat, hence it has food value. Dr. Davis, of Chicago, more than twenty years ago took up the question of the development of animal heat from alcohol, and by carefully conducted experiments he demonstrated the fact that so far from the heat of the system being increased under the influence of alcohol, it was actually decreased. Nutritious food increases the temperature of the body, but alcohol in any form or mixture will depress the temperature below normal, the extent of the depression corresponding to the amount taken. Heat and strength are not increased by alcohol, as the tests of Dr. Davis with delicate thermometer and dynamometer abundantly proved.

Aside from the above consideration we can readily see that a body to be recognized as food must possess other functions besides the accidental one of caloric. All particles of the body eliminated by physiological functions and the waste of disease must be replaced. Any substance that will, by assimilation with the system, build up waste tissue and thus assist the system in its normal growth must be recognized as a food substance. But alcohol does not do this. Its most ardent friends cannot, and do not, make such a claim. Alcohol destroys protoplasm; therefore it cannot build up protoplasm; a substance that corrodes tissue and degenerates blood corpuscles cannot be a conservator of normal conditions. In a pamphlet entitled, "*Is Alcohol a Food or a Poison?*" by Dr. Max Kassorvitz, Prof. in the University of Vienna, translated from the German by Mrs. J. H. W. Stuckenberg, of Cambridge, Mass., the eminent author says: "We can no longer think of administering the toxin of the yeast-germ as food, with the idea of retarding tissue waste in febrile states or wasting disease. It would be a

strange procedure to introduce into the body for the purpose of retarding waste, a substance which itself attacks and destroys living protoplasm." T. J. Mobins, M.D., a nerve specialist of Leipsic, says: "The fact is, all this talk about the nutritive value, the strengthening and curative properties of alcohol, is nothing but a cloak the drinker employs to conceal his appetite. If people did not care about drinking, nobody would concern himself about the trifling nutritive value claimed for alcohol." "We cannot be too energetic," says Dr. Henry Meyer, "in denouncing the assertion that alcohol is nourishing and strengthening, useful and necessary to the laboring classes; that it improves plain food by making it more palatable and that it assists its digestion; that it warms the body in winter, and then turns about and cools it in summer. Nothing of all this is true." Experience in the armies and navies of the world have abundantly established the truth of that assertion.

When in 1862, the Army of the Potomac was encamped in the Wilderness, an order was promulgated allowing each officer and soldier 150 gm. (5 ounces approx.) of whiskey, in two potions. The sanitary condition of the army, however, declined so rapidly after this measure, that the commander saw the necessity of rescinding the order after it had been in force only four weeks, and Dr. Frank Hamilton, a medical attache, expressed himself as follows: "It is to be hoped that such experiments will not be repeated in the future. Experience and observation has firmly convinced us that the use of alcohol in case of healthy persons, is in no sense beneficial. We make no exception as to weather or climatic conditions, nor even in the case of former imbibers as soon as they become soldiers." It is a matter of record that Lord Kitchener, commander of the English army in Africa, insisted on the withholding of liquors from the army, and returned to England in his transports the beer that without his knowledge had been shipped with the troops. The *London Times* and *Daily News* lauded the General for his order, and spoke of the return of the beer as a wise sanitary measure.

Medical experts connected with the armies of the leading na-

tions of the world, seem to be agreed in their testimony against the use of alcoholics among troops, and many of them are in favor of total prohibition. General Leitensdorfer, an officer in the army of Bavaria, in his "*Militaerische Training*," 1897, expresses his convictions as follows: "However valuable alcohol may be as a stimulant when, in case of acute disease, it may be necessary to assist the heart or the organs of respiration momentarily when necessity demands haste in a crisis, or to guard by its use against utter exhaustion, so illusory is its worth as a means of stimulating energy in muscular exertion. Its effect in the latter case is not only too brief, but exceedingly hazardous because of the relaxing and soporific reaction induced. It is quite evident that the muscular energy for sustained exertion begotten of alcohol is not only superfluous, but most harmful, and not of the nature of that sought in military training. We therefore recognize the wisdom of the prohibition of liquor in the higher sports, and in military service where valor and bravery are demanded. An army consuming no alcohol is far superior to one using it. The former far exceeds the latter in power of will, endurance and moral worth. A time is coming, when conflicts will not be decided by exactness of aim, or range of gun and masses of men, but according to the physical and moral ability of the contestants. Until that time, it will be well, in the training of the individual or the masses, to recognize temperance and sobriety as the principal virtues of the soldier, and alcohol as the most dangerous enemy of discipline, and a bridge to a condition of physical and moral flaccidity which must lead to the undoing of any army."

Of like import is the testimony of those engaged in the merchant marine and in polar and naval expeditions. The general conviction among captains and masters of vessels is that alcohol interferes seriously with necessary discipline, and that it is not a necessity either in the tropics or in the polar regions. Nansen (according to Hoppe), crossed Greenland with his men, and the greatest hardships were endured without the use of alcoholics. In his subsequent Polar expedition he and his men spent three years in high polar regions, and he

attributes the success achieved to the non-use of alcoholics. "My experience" says Nansen, "prompts me to the emphatic declaration against the use of alcoholic stimulants and narcotics of every kind. It seems to me to be a sound principle, to live at all times as natural and simple as possible. And especially do I consider this course necessary when confined for any length of time in regions of extreme cold, where the physical organism is taxed to the utmost in the expenditure of strength. The idea that there can be a gain by the artificial stimulation of the body or mind betrays, to my thinking, ignorance of the simplest physiological laws; a want of experience, or want of ability to profit from ordinary observation. Stimulants offer the body no nutriment, and the anticipated energy can only be momentary, and must be followed by a corresponding exhaustion and depression."

John Ross, in his second "*Voyage de Discoveries*," etc., 1829, claims to have shipped no spirituous liquors, and won his men over to his own temperance principles. He says: "It is difficult to convince men, even those who would frown upon the habitual use of stimulants, that they do not strengthen, but rather weaken the body. They are stimulants, infusing momentary courage. And this effect is supposed to be increased strength. It is not necessary to be a close observer in order to be convinced that the result is far otherwise."

Count Von Gaetzen, who crossed Central Africa in 1893-94, in an address before the Scientific Association of Frankfort (1896), declares it to be his firm conviction that success in explorations within the tropics can only be expected by a recognition of the principles of temperance or, "better still, total prohibition."

I. R. Ballet in his "*Voyage aux mers polaires sur le Prince Albert* (1852-54), expresses himself as follows: "We had on board neither wine, beer, nor other spirituous drinks, and I do not hesitate to ascribe to this wise regulation the excellent demeanor, and the contentment of our crew, in spite of privations and the lack of comforts to which we were exposed." Nansen, whose expedition was for more than three years cut off from the rest of the world in comfortless and horrible solitude, de-

scribes very interestingly how he succeeded in harmless ways in banishing the feeling of loneliness and tediousness, without the use of liquors. In a journey of fifteen months on sleds, not a drop of liquor was used, and a want of it was not expressed nor felt. The Belgic marine officer de Garlach in his expedition to the South Pole for scientific research, ordered alcoholics in the shape of drinks to be excluded from the supplies to be shipped. Dr. Livingstone's testimony is unequivocal: "I have, for twenty years, lived according to the principles of total abstinence from alcoholics, and I believe the most difficult labor can be performed, and greatest hardships can be endured without their use."

Count Von Gaetzen at a convention of naturalists in Frankfurt A. M., 1896, said: "The temperate use of, nay, the total abstinence from, alcoholics in expeditions and explorations within the tropics is a fundamental principle for success."

Emin Pasha declares: "One who avoids the use of alcholic drinks can safely smile at the nursery-tales of danger of life in the tropics."

Professor Wahlman says: "The greatest enemy the Germans have in Africa is alcohol in the form of beer, and cognac, and wine. It is not the African fever that is so much to be dreaded, but the effects of the use of the stimulants, predisposing the user to the inroads of disease." Dr. George Kolb, 1898, make the following declaration: "I am not a 'tempernzler' in the ordinary use of the word, but I do not feel that I am on that account debarred from saying that I consider the use of stimulants in the form of alcohol, as altogether unnecessary here in Germany, and my experience leads me to declare their use in Africa to be extremely dangerous; absolutely so under all circumstances, in all latitudes and altitudes. I know it will be difficult to bring Germany, where temperance is so much derided, to a recognition of this truth, and it is therefore more the duty of every patriot to call attention to the fact that the use of beer, wine, and brandy, in a tropical climate is far more dangerous than all bacillae and plasmodia." Dr. Riedel, of Delhi, India, claims that the health of Europeans in India is conditioned on their use or non-use of alcoholic stimulants.

Dr. Fiebig declares that persons addicted to the daily use of 20-60 grains of alcohol, can not harden themselves against a tropical climate. "Many moderate drinkers suddenly collapse. Their life goes out like the snuffing of a candle." The French General Gallieni declares it to be less dangerous to drink unwholesome water in the tropics, than any kind of alcoholic drink.

Alcohol plays a most important part as a cause of disease. A single excess, to slight intoxication, may be followed by a number of physical disorders, according to the individuality of the imbibor and the quantity of alcohol imbibed. One excess frequently causes catarrh of the stomach, headache, nausea, increasing until vomiting is induced, bodily and mental dullness and sullenness. In many cases other organs are involved. Dr. Glasser instituted a minute examination of fifteen persons, after forty alcohol excesses. After each excess the urine contained abnormal elements—an indication spoken of by physicians as inflammation of the kidneys. In the deposits there were present crystals of oxilate of lime, and uric or lithic acid. These pathological elements ceased to appear after one or two days. The larger quantity of the crystals voided is an indication of the power of alcohol to change and injure the proper assimilation of matter. If these alcoholic excesses be indulged in for any length of time, it will not be long before other organs will become involved. The cells become fatty and cease to exercise their normal functions, the circulation is disturbed, and the kidneys may become permanently injured. Dr. Struempel, of Erlangen, considers nephritis the most prevalent disease among drunkards. Dr. D. Formad found evidences of the drunkard's kidney in 248 out of 250 cases. It is not the wine and brandy drinker alone that is thus affected, but particularly the beer drinker. "A man dies suddenly in the best of his years, of inflamed kidney, and your conclusion amounts to a certainty, that he was a lover of beer or other strong drink." The moderate use of beer even may lay the foundation for degeneration of the kidney, though the effect may not manifest itself until the age of fifty (*Brit. Med. Journal*, 1872). To find the urine heavily loaded with albumin is nothing un-

usual in the case of even moderate drinkers. In Munich, where large quantities of beer are drunk, the degenerated kidney is so frequently found in post-mortem examinations, that it has become customary to speak of a "beer kidney."

With equal frequency probably, in sections, is found the "beer heart," an enlargement of the heart substance, idiopathic heart hypertrophy. "The comparative weight of the hearts of the men in Munich is greater than that of other sections, owing to beer excess" (Dr. F. Bauer and Prof. O. Bollinger, Munich, 1892.) In many instances the enlargement is so excessive that physicians speak of an "oxheart" (Boucardia). "The first symptom," so Anfrechts describes the disease, "is shortness of breath on slight exertion. In this stage of the disease there may be recovery, if the patient will abstain from the use of alcohol. Later on there are evidences of the progress of the disease when recovery can not be hoped for. The muscles of the heart become hypertrophied, the liver is enlarged, and the kidneys show signs of degeneration. The patient has not drunk too much, never was intoxicated, and yet the inner organs have received irreparable injury. The heart has been balasted with fat, it has greatly increased in volume, and the arteries have suffered. These vessels have been subjected to a fatty and atheromatous degeneration. Their walls have been plated with lime, causing them to loose their elasticity (artero-sclerosis), and by their rigidity greater labor is imposed on the heart, causing palpitation and inviting rupture of the vessels."

Edgreen (1898), in an examination of 124 patients found 31 cases of artero-sclerosis, 25 per cent. traceable to alcohol. Dr. Lankester, F.R.S., in his *School Manual of Health*, observes: "Even diluted in the form of beer or wine, alcohol is found to act injuriously on the delicate membranes of the stomach and other digestive organs. When taken in larger quantities in any of the diluted forms, it acts most injuriously upon the stomach, liver, brain, heart and other organs of the body." The organs most affected by alcohol through the stomach are, according to Professors Perrin and Lallemand, of Paris, "the liver, and the substance of the brain." That intemperance is

one of the conditions tending to inflammation of the encephalon is recognized by most writers upon the subject. In many cases apoplexy, paralysis, and epilepsy with intemperance, the relation is as cause and effect. Stomach and intestinal catarrh has, in by far the greater number of cases its origin in the use of alcohol. This stomach catarrh is recognized by the morning vomit, "water colic." Ulceration of the stomach frequently accompanies this morning sickness, and may lead to hemorrhage or perforation, and end fatally. Gout (arthritis) is another of the diseases frequently induced by alcohol. Until recent years this was, at least in England, not a disease of the poorer classes. Since the drinking of porter has become more prevalent it has spread widely among all classes.

It seems hardly necessary to call attention to the fact that the use of alcohol predisposes to consumption (phthisis pulmonalis). This can hardly be otherwise when we remember the harmful effects of alcohol on the organs of respiration and digestion. The system has been weakened, so as not to be able to resist the inroads of disease. The superficial breathing, the heart insufficiency and defective nutrition, all mark the subject as predisposed to provide a camping ground for the bacillus tuberculosis, especially as the blood serum has been weakened as to its bactericidal powers. According to Fournier, Lanceraux and Mackenzie (1897), the tuberculous infection develops very rapidly in the case of drunkards, and the disease speedily ends in death. Dr. Volland says: "The life of a tuberculous drunkard is generally suddenly extinguished, like the snuffing out of a candle."

Another disease with which alcohol stands in intimate relation is the loathsome syphilis, which, with other sexual diseases, is often contracted in a condition of drunkenness or semi-drunkenness. The abuse of alcohol has a tendency to make men more sexual, and more disposed to follow the promptings of sexual lust. Prof. Kraepelin, Jena, 1900, in "Psychiatric Problems of the State" says: "There is no doubt that syphilis is often contracted by young men, especially students and officers, when in a condition of drunkenness." Prof.

Fick, in "The Scenes of Drunkenness after the Banquet" (1892), speaking of the festival held in honor of the International Congress of Physicians, Berlin, in August, 1890, says: "4000 cards of entry were issued, 15382 flasks of wine, 300 cognacs, and 22 h. l. of beer (1 h. l. is 26 2-5 gal.) were consumed. The scenes of drunkenness after the banquet in the great saloon, upon the stairways, and in front of the building were disgusting beyond measure. As the muck-fly scents the carrion, so there had gathered, in front of the city hall, a swarm of venal maidens, who gathered a rich booty from the drunken, reeling, staggering, tottering guests. I shudder to think, that an honored head of a family was enticed into an act which brought to him a syphilitic infection which may entail ruin upon a beloved family, and may be transplanted and perpetuated for generations." Of course such awful consequences of the hilarious debauch may never be known, but every experienced physician knows only too well that they are not among the rarities.

It is well known that all diseases affect alcoholics with greater severity and intensity. Recovery from wounds and operations are tedious and more uncertain. A simple wound that would heal readily on a person in normal condition, may lead to serious consequences and to death in the case of an alcoholic. Especially dreaded is the drunkards' frenzy, which frequently supervenes a wound or an operation. Dr. Hayfelder noticed that in the case of Tartars and Turks many complicated bodily injuries were readily overcome without fever or other deleterious symptoms, whilst in the case of Russians in the same hospital ward, and attended by the same physicians and surgeons the process of recovery frequently was tedious and complicated. He claims that the Turkish troops are superior to the Russians in power of endurance, and in the ability to resist the inroads of disease, and he ascribes this in a large measure to the fact that the Russians are imbibers, whilst the religion of the Turks binds them to the strictest observance of the principles of prohibition from alcoholic drinks.

Life insurance companies have long since recognized the increased risk assumed in insuring alcoholics. The United

Kingdom Temperance and General Provident Institution was organized in London in 1841, with the avowed understanding of restricting its risks entirely to total abstainers. It was found however that this class was not sufficiently large to bring the cost of insurance within the expected limits, and the choice presented itself of either retiring from business or extending insurance to non-abstainers. The latter alternative was accepted, but distinct lists of the two classes were kept, and the results, down to 1874 were published. "In the abstinence department the actual experience fell short of the expectation in death-rate about 39 per cent., whilst among moderate users of alcohol the death-rate was also below the expectation, but only one-tenth of one per cent." Although these data are from too limited a field to show a general rule, they are worthy of serious thought. Mr. Nelson, the English actuary, investigated the risks of life companies with special reference to the effects of alcoholism, and his conclusions are embodied in these propositions.

1. When in a given number of risks, ten persons of temperate habits die between the ages of 15 and 20 inclusive, eighteen intemperate persons die.

2. When in a given number of risks ten temperate persons die between the ages of 21 and 30 inclusive, fifty-one intemperate persons die.

3. When in a given number of risks ten temperate persons die between the ages of 31-40 inclusive, about forty intemperate persons die.

The average expectancy of life is given by him as follows :

At twenty, a temperate person may live 44.2, years, an intemperate person, 15.6 years.

At thirty the figures stand respectively 36.5, and 13.8.

At forty, temperate 28.8, intemperate 11.6 years.

The above life insurance company has prepared tabulated statements of its two classes of policy-holders, in periods of five years with results, as follows :

| PERIODS. | TEMPERANCE CLASS. | | GENERAL CLASS. | |
|-----------|-------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| | Expected Deaths. | Actual Deaths. | Expected Deaths. | Actual Deaths. |
| 1866-1870 | 549 | 411 or 74.8 p.c. | 1008 | 944 or 93.0 p.c. |
| 1871-1875 | 723 | 511 or 70.1 " | 1268 | 1330 or 104.9 " |
| 1876-1880 | 933 | 651 or 69.6 " | 1485 | 1480 or 99.6 " |
| 1881-1885 | 1179 | 835 or 70.8 " | 1670 | 1530 or 91.6 " |
| 1886-1890 | 1472 | 1015 or 68.9 " | 1846 | 1750 or 94.8 " |
| 1891-1895 | 1686 | 1203 or 70.1 " | 1958 | 1953 or 99.7 " |
| 1896-1899 | 1506 | 1098 or 79.9 " | 1634 | 1482 or 92.7 " |
| 1866-1899 | 8048 | 5742 or 71.1 " | 10869 | 10469 or 96.3 " |

The Mutual Life of New York, in a circular dated January 17, 1878, through its trustees, gave emphatic warning to all its policy holders, by stating that there had been an alarming increase in the death rate "of late years," caused directly or indirectly by the increased use of intoxicants. The circular concluded as follows: "In taking this action the Board of Trustees is not to be understood as casting any imputation upon the integrity or the habits of the great body of the insured. It is believed that the membership of this company, as a class, is superior in intelligence, sobriety and thrift, to that of any similar organizations in this country, and any intention to enter the arena of debatable questions in religion, morals or political economy, is expressly disavowed; this is purely a matter of business, in which the company relies for its protection on a proper administration of the laws of contract." "During the past year many policies upon the lives of persons who had become notoriously intemperate, have been canceled. It is our determination to pursue this course in the future; and if any to whom this circular shall come are conscious that persistence in evil ways is invalidating their legal claims upon the company, we warn them that they may be laying up a legacy of disappointment, instead of the beneficent provisions against want which an honorable fulfillment of their engagement will secure."

It is quite generally recognized that the toxic effects of alcohol are the cause of many forms of psychic degeneration.

According to Wilkins, drunkenness, directly or indirectly, is a greater cause of insanity than all other causes combined.

According to the report of the Prussian Imperial Sanitary Commission, there were received into the public and private institutions of Prussia in 1886-1888, 32,068 patients; 3531 of these, or 11 per cent. were delirium tremens patients. The number of those suffering to a more or less degree from psychic degeneration induced by alcohol were, 1886, 40.4 per cent.; 1887, 42.3 per cent.; 1888, 44.5 per cent. In 1893 the city of Berlin had 4398 patients in its institution for the insane, 50 per cent. of which were alcoholics. Of 623 men received into the Hertzberg Institution of Berlin in 1895-96, 280 or 44.9 per cent. were alcoholics. For Dresden the figures stand as follows: 1892, 33.2 per cent., 1893, 32 per cent., 1894, 30.4. In the Bremen Institution there were received, 1876-85, 1223 patients, 33.9 per cent. of which were alcoholics. In Frankfurt A. M. in 1897-98, 35.6 per cent. of the patients received into the institution were alcoholics; 14.4 per cent. of all patients received into the public institutions for the sick and insane in Breslau, 1896-97, were alcoholics.

The above represents the condition of things in almost every institution for the care of the insane in Germany, France, Switzerland and Austria.

Since 1889 insanity has been on the increase in England. The rate of increase for London is given at 25 per cent., whilst the rate of increase of population is stated to be 6 per cent. In Birmingham the insane from alcohol number 24.4 per cent. of the male, and 24.8 per cent. of the female inmates of the Hospital for the Insane.

There were received into the Edinburgh Insane Asylum in 1896, 470 patients, 22.34 per cent. of whom were sufferers from alcoholism. Drunkenness among women is increasing rapidly in England. In 1898 the number of male inmates of public and private institutions for the insane, sufferers from alcoholism, was 36 per cent. and that of the women 25 per cent. of the whole number. According to the report of Dr. Parish of the State Board of Lunacy of the State of New

York, the institutions of that State received from 1880-1895, 19,237 patients. Of these 1776 suffered psychic degeneration induced by alcohol.

In Massachusetts the seven State Institutions for the Insane received 1891-1898, 8475 male patients, and 7950 female patients. Of the former 23.5 per cent., and of the latter 8.5 per cent. were sufferers because of induced alcoholic degeneration.

And, what an important part alcohol plays in the annals of crime!

Lord Chief Justice Coleridge of England declared in 1897: "Most acts of violence and crime have their origin in the tavern and originate in drunkenness. We would be able to close nine-tenths of our prisons and jails if we could make England sober." In Edinburgh, 1874-78, 58.3 per cent. of all arrests were on account of alcoholic excesses. In 1872 the arrests for drunkenness and for crimes committed in a condition of drunkenness was 64.8 per cent. of all arrests. Liverpool 62.3 per cent., Leeds 42.7 per cent., Rockdale 43.5 per cent. Of 2421 persons arrested in Philadelphia, 2020 were alcoholics. Dr. Harris claims that 80 per cent. of all criminals imprisoned in the State of New York owe their imprisonment to alcoholic excesses. Of 53,459 persons arrested in Massachusetts in 1872-74, 35,755, or 66.9 per cent. were arrested for drunkenness or for crimes growing out of drunkenness; 81.9 per cent. of all persons convicted of crime and sentenced owe their sentence directly or indirectly to drink.

Of 40,807 arrested in Pennsylvania in 1872, 32,755 or 80.3 per cent. were arrested on account of drink. In the State's prison for the eastern districts of Pennsylvania there were, from 1892-1894, 1728 prisoners; 50.7 per cent. were classed as moderate drinkers, 32.7 per cent. as immoderate drinkers, and 16.6 per cent. as abstainers.

In the state's prison of Missouri in 1875-1876, 58 per cent. were classed as drunkards. In the State's prison at Elmira, New York, 1892, of 132 prisoners, 52, or 39.39 per cent. were classed as occasional drunks, 65, or 49.25 per cent. as habitual drunks, and 2, or 1.51 per cent. as periodical drunks. Of all

criminals in Canada, 90 per cent. of the men, and 95 per cent. of the women are made such through strong drink.

We had hoped that we would be able to trace the effects of the drink custom upon home life, its relation to divorce, and infanticide, and race degeneracy, but our article already exceeds the limits we had intended, and there remain but two phases of our indictment to which we desire to call attention.

And, first, as American citizens we must learn rightly to estimate the saloon and its power for evil in the community and in the State. It is through this agency principally that alcohol has been able to intrench itself among us, work its baneful influence and attain its awful power.

It is through the saloon that alcohol can defy the law; subsidize the press and anesthetize judges and jurors. In a small volume published two years ago, *Chicago's Dark Places*, the author shows, as quoted by the *Arena*, the methods employed by the liquor interests to subvert the law and defy all considerations of common decency. He says: "The Brewers' Association stands ready to pay the costs, and defend its members in all cases, whether they have been guilty of violating the law or not." When it is taken into consideration that the Chicago Brewers' Association is but one of hundreds of similar associations in every part of our country to protect its own interests, and the interests of its saloon keepers; and that the associations or the individual brewers own most of the saloons, and the saloon keeper is in most cases, and in fact must be, the willing tool in the hands of those representing vast capital, it can readily be seen that this power can defy all law and order, and that the citizen who would dare to protect his own home against a hellish curse is placed beyond the protection of the law. The above author further on has this to say: "The law requires the saloonist to keep closed on Sunday, yet a large number of saloons are open every Sunday in defiance of this law. The saloon keeper is required not to sell to minors without a written permit from parent or guardian, and yet there are thousands of saloons which pay no regard to this requirement. They are forbidden to harbor women of bad repute. And yet

we are informed that one saloon in Chicago keeps from twenty-five to forty harlots, while in hosts of other saloons special arrangements are made for the gratification of all forms of nameless immoralities which spring from lust, fed and inflamed by rum." Since the opening of the present year a new scheme has been put in operation by one of the Chicago liquor firms; a firm that has in hand the business of the "high class" saloons of the city. It has opened a "Ladies' Store," in order to supply the "home trade." "'Ladies' will wait on the customers, among congenial surroundings, and orders will be filled with intelligence." The stigma which until now has attached to woman's direct contact with the saloon is to be removed, and the degradation of the home is to be made more respectable. And why is it that decent society permits these outrages against law and order, and against the common decencies of moral life? Because moral society in America has been hypnotized by the drink evil. No municipality in Illinois, nor in any other license State, can of itself shake off the curse. The web and woof of society in the cities lack moral courage, and unless the rural districts and prohibition States rise to the occasion, and that speedily, the condition will become irremediable. To day the saloon interests own the State. The saloon interests control votes enough to turn the tide of any election. These interests control primaries; they control county and state conventions and elections; they control, for they have subsidized, the press. It is the "deadly upas" of the twentieth century civilization. In Chicago alone, there are over 6000 saloons. The author of *Chicago's Dark Places* claims that in the year ending March 1, 1901, the expenditure for beer alone, in Chicago was forty million dollars. He places the population at about 1,200,000. This gives an average of \$33.25 for every man, woman and child in Chicago, and this he claims is "conservative figuring." If this vast sum was spent for beer alone, it can be taken for granted that Chicago's drink bill for that year exceeded eighty million dollars. And that, at a time, when the local papers claimed that there were thirty thousand men in the city unemployed, wandering about seeking for means to earn their daily

bread. At a time when the inspectors in the interests of the compulsory school law reported that there were a great number of children in the city so destitute as to be absolutely unfit to attend school, "decency forbidding that the sexes in far more than semi-nude condition should mingle in the schoolroom." "One night in February, 1901, one hundred and twenty-four destitute and homeless men begged for shelter in the cells of the police stations. Of these sixty-eight were native-born Americans. Fourteen men passed the night in a space eight by nine and a half feet, some standing part of the time to afford others room to sleep on the floor, packed like sardines."

The story of *Chicago's Dark Places* is the story of every great city in this country, and comparatively that of every town and hamlet in license States within the Union. Let any older citizen in any town or village where taverns and saloons exist pass through one of its streets and count the homes to his right and left that have been blighted and the minds that have gone out in darkness; and call up from the pages of memory the faces of those whom he knew in the freshness and bloom of youth, and saw go down into a drunkard's grave, and think of the tears and anguish and pain and poverty and disgrace that came between the first glass, and the thud of the sod upon the coffin lid, and he will realize in a measure the curse of drink. Only in a measure. For it requires a judgment day, and the records of a just and omnipotent and omniscient God to reveal it all.

Well, but what of the future? Prof. Hoppe furnishes me this thought. If in former ages the rich, the high and exalted indulged to excess, the great body of the middle class and the poor remained untouched, and when, after two, three or four generations such a class had exhausted its physical and psychic power, it sank out of sight, and another class whose predecessors had husbanded their strength, in poverty it may be, took its place. And when, in the past whole tribes and races wasted their power and energies in profligate living, they were pushed to the wall, or utterly obliterated by other tribes or races not thus weakened.

What, however can be the hopes for humanity, poisoned

through and through by the poison of alcohol? Where is there a people to-day free from its blighting influences. Our lust of greed has seen to it that Africa, India, China, Japan, Australia, the Philippines and every isle of the sea in every habitable part of the globe, is placed under tribute to the universal curse. Where can we look for a reserve force to stem the mighty tide. When humanity shall have lost its physical and psychic strength, who or what people will be equal to the mighty intellectual problems of the future, and settle and adjust the problem arising from conditions of congested populations, and other conditions, which will demand for their solution the highest possible physical and mental development.

ARTICLE IV.

THE TAKING OF THE CROSS: A DEVOTIONAL STUDY OF THE CRUSADES.

BY REV. JAMES A. B. SCHERER, PH.D.

With the twelfth century, while the dawn from the Dark Ages was as yet unbroken, appeared that romantic and spirited movement of history known as the Crusades. Europe had been sleeping; not the sleep of sweet rest and pleasant dreams, but the distressed, horrid slumber of nightmare. During the ninth and tenth centuries there had been no less than fifty incursions of the Northmen throughout France, which they swept as with a besom of destruction; while countless whirlwinds of the Huns devastated the whole of Europe, until the fields were actually left untilled, becoming, as in primeval times, the dwelling-place of numberless wild beasts, which herded in human homesteads, unafraid, and, in turn, less dreaded than these human beasts of Huns. They were wandering shepherd tribes, natives of the north of Asia, and inhabiting the vast plains between Russia and China. "They had no houses. They lived in tents, in which they also stabled their horses. From being constantly on horseback their legs were crooked. They were short men, broad-shouldered, with strong muscular

arms; had coarse, thick lips, straight, black, wiry hair, little, round, sloe-like eyes, yellow complexions, and sausage noses. They were filthy in their habits. Their horrible ugliness, their disgusting smell, their ferocity, the speed with which they moved, their insensibility to the gentler feelings, made the Goths, with whom they first came in contact, believe they were half demons. They ate, drank, and slept on horseback. Their no less hideous wives and children followed them in wagons. They ate roots and raw meat. They seemed insensible to hunger, thirst, and cold." To complete the repulsiveness of this interesting picture from the pages of Baring-Gould, we need only to add that the weapons with which these frightful folk fought were the sword, the spear, the battle-axe, and, chiefly, the terrible Tartar bows. They seemed created and equipped of the arch-fiend himself.

With the coming of barbarians into the land, there was a revival of barbarism among the people. "One feels almost, in reading the foul and frightful annals, as if the ancient Pagan temper, driven into the air or trodden into the soil before the armies of the empire, had settled back densely and heavily upon Europe, and was infecting and poisoning the very springs of spiritual life." This was true, not only of the people, but also of their princes, and even of the popes. It is no figure of speech to say that the "vicars of Christ" became the devotees of Satan. Not only were satanic rites actually practiced at the Vatican, but the spirit of evil reigned there, the pontifical palace at one time becoming little else than "a vast school of prostitution." These are not the slanders of Protestantism. Why, indeed, should not we feel as deeply as the Roman Catholics the shame of those awful days, seeing that the Church of Rome is the mother of us all? The French Catholic, Mabillon, out of many that might be cited, confesses that most of the popes of the tenth century "lived rather like monsters, or like wild beasts, than like bishops." Let us hear also from Cardinal Newman on this subject. In his "Essays, Critical and Historical" he declares that "no exaggeration is possible of the demoralized state into which the Christian world, and especially the

Church of Rome, had fallen in the years that followed the extinction of the Carovingian line (A. D., 887). * * * * At the close of the ninth century Pope Stephen VI dragged the body of an obnoxious predecessor from the grave, and, after subjecting it to a mock trial, cut off its head and threw it into the Tiber. He himself was subsequently deposed, and strangled in prison. In the years that followed, the power of electing to the popedom actually fell into the hands of intriguing and licentious Theodora and her equally unprincipled daughters. * * * * Boniface VII (A. D., 974), in the space of a few weeks after his elevation, plundered the treasury and basilica of St. Peter of all he could conveniently carry off and fled to Constantinople. * * * * Benedict IX (A. D., 1033), was consecrated pope, according to some authorities, at the age of ten or twelve years, and became notorious for adulteries and murders. At length he resolved on marrying his first cousin; and when her father would not consent except on the condition of his resigning the popedom, he sold it for a large sum, and consecrated the purchaser as his successor. Such are a few of the most prominent features of the ecclesiastical history of those dreadful times, when, in the words of St. Bruno, 'the world lay in wickedness, holiness had disappeared, justice had perished, and truth had been buried.' It was a Pagan revival of indefinitely greater strength and evil than that of Julian the Apostate; for then Paganism was without the Church, but now the Church itself is Paganized. Tiberius and Caligula, those monsters of heathendom, were now outdone by the "holy fathers" of Christendom, who vied with one another in the practice of the vilest vices, the rule of the Christian Church being actually called, and truthfully called, a "Pornocracy."

The distress of the people was most profound. As though the natural terrors were not sufficiently acute, they fell into abnormal fear of the supernatural. It was believed that the end of the world was nigh. Fearful portents were seen in sky and sea. Every night men laid weary heads upon their pillows, in dread expectation of the midnight tramp of doom.

Each morning the sun blanched their faces with the promise of a burning world. Nerveless, they forsook accustomed tasks, awaiting in idle cowardice the final hour. Famine fell upon the land. Greece, Italy, France, and England were involved in it. The people actually fell into the horrors of cannibalism. "Men ate earth, weeds, roots, the bark of trees, vermin, dead bodies." Mothers devoured their children, and children their mothers, in the frenzy of hunger. Men were murdered to be eaten, and human flesh was almost openly sold in the markets. Storrs says: "The multitude of the dead was so great that they could not be buried, and wolves flocked to feast on their bodies. Great numbers were tumbled promiscuously into vast trenches. A state of fierce cannibal savagery appeared likely to mark the end of a fallen and ruined race, for which the Lord had died in vain. It was not wonderful that men following their dead relations to the grave sometimes cast themselves into it, to end at once their intolerable life." The Roman Catholic historian, Michelet, has dramatically pointed out that "the very statues of the period are sad and pinched, as if the dreadful apprehension of the age had sunk into the softened stone." It was the age of the power of darkness. The whole world lay in wickedness, and the Church of Christ was asleep.

Then, in that darkest, stillest hour, which is just before the dawn, a silver bugle rang clear and shrill, like the call of the chancicleer. It was God's breath that filled it; and it thrilled with the music of Christ's name. From sea to sea, from land to land it sounded. Men rubbed their eyes; leaped to their feet in the darkness; buckled on their scabbards; flashed blades high in the unresponsive air; shouted to chill gray dawn, "It is the will of God!" and rushed, six hundred thousand strong, towards the holy city of Jerusalem, "to break the heathen and uphold the Christ." Seven times it roused new sleepers to the hurry of impetuous warfare; seven times the sons of re-awakening Europe flung themselves across these as against the sullen Saracens, who stood like a dark wall between them and the holy home of their Lord the Christ—only to be cast back on the sodden shores, clotted with the blood of defeat, or else pale corpses. Even children, a score of thousand children,

mere tender babes, piped with their treble voices, "It is the will of God!" and sought to redeem, with swords in their dimpled hands, the home of the Babe of Bethlehem; but they, too—O pitiful!—were lost, a myriad babes in the wood, their only shroud the leaves, their only priest the robin.

What a catastrophe! men will say, have said. The Crusades—what a failure, what a vast mistake of history! But, in the end history does not make mistakes. When we cannot understand her, it is only because we are not wise enough. For history is the handmaid of the Almighty, and "facts are the finger of God." The Crusades? Men of science tell us that to every sleeper, in every night, comes a moment fraught with the baleful threat of death. The tide of his blood is ebbing. The hammer of his pulse is silent. The great engine of the heart throbs its last and faintest. Then, they tell us, unless at that fearful time there come some stir of warning to the sleeper, some whispering call from the depths of the darkness to startle the engine to its work again, and the pulse to its duty, and the blood to its flow—then the heart sleeps forever, and when friends come in the morning they find a dead man there. So we may say that the call to the Crusades saved the life of Europe. Their origin has been a mystery. Historians have stood amazed at this vast sudden movement of millions towards the same frail sentimental goal. But the call to the Crusades was the call of God. The sleepers stirred. Their pulses set a-beating to the quick throb of war drums. The sluggish blood sprang once more like a brook. The Crusaders were defeated, but Europe was saved, because she was awake. The darkness was overpast. New life came, as always, out of the East into the West: From that moment the page of history brightens. The period of those strange holy wars, apparently so unsuccessful, is precisely the period of the dawn from the darkest age that has ever eclipsed the world since Christ was slain, into the requickened life of day. And so, in the wiser way, those wars were gloriously successful. God's thoughts are not as man's thoughts. "He moves in a mysterious way, His wonders to perform." The call to the Crusades was a thoughtfull loving device of the great watchful Father to save

his sleeping children from the sleep of death, as he waked them with the music of Christ's name.

Moreover, the Crusades did a service not for Europe only, but for the whole world; not for that age alone, but for all time. Think what a flower grew up from the blood of those fallen knights! It is the flower of chivalry. Shame on that cheap humor that would pawn our holiest traditions for a laugh! Pity it is that all of us "Yankees" could not go and dwell for a season in King Arthur's court, there to learn at least a higher worship than the worship of the dollar. No single gift has come to us from Christianity, that great source of all best gifts, which is of sweeter influence in the mutual relationships of men than the spirit of chivalry. The knights, once sworn to a noble cause, were always malcontent with ignobility. Unsuccessful in attaining the material object of their warfare, they did but learn a firmer grasp on the snowy fields of the ideal. Failing to gain possession of the Holy Land, they yet were led, through pursuing a noble and romantic purpose, to know of a holier land, of that fair kingdom of God which is within. The inspiring history of that holy city, Jerusalem, which they sought in vain to take and keep, told them of a greatness which is greater than that of taking a city. Schooled in the noble discipline of fighting, unafraid, whole hordes of overwhelming heathen, they were wed forever to the battle of the weak against the strong, and so returned from fighting the strong men of the East to fight for the weak of the West. The knight's banner, once uplifted, never falls: for it is the essence of knighthood to battle for ideals, and ideals are unaffected by material failures. You cannot hurt a spirit. See, then, what rich bequest comes to the world from these fanatical Crusades. They taught the world the battle of the weak against the strong; the battle for the spiritual against the material and gross; the battle of ideals against dollars; the battle for women against villains; of romanticism against realism; of poetry against the prosaic; of right against wrong. But for the Crusades, men perhaps would not know the manly gesture of baring the head to women—that remarkable tribute of physical

strength to spiritual strength. But for the Crusades there might be now no clear-eyed lad to defend a child against a bully. But for the Crusades, our minstrelsy would be unspeakably impoverished; for the story of the foolish doings of those romantic knights has been the theme of all our wisest music since their time.

Tennyson's glowing pages draw all their light from chivalry. The great Victorian poet has, indeed, uttered the very creed of knighthood for us, when, speaking as King Arthur to his knights, he cries:

"I made them lay their hands in mine and swear
To reverence the King, as if he were
Their conscience, and their conscience as their king,
To break the heathen and uphold the Christ,
To ride abroad redressing human wrongs,
To speak no slander, no, nor listen to it,
To lead sweet lives in purest chastity,
To love one maiden only, cleave to her,
And worship her by years of noble deeds
Until they won her; for indeed I knew
Of no more subtle master under heaven
Than is the maiden passion for a maid,
Not only to keep down the base in man,
But teach high thoughts, and amiable words,
And courtliness, and the desire of fame
And love of truth and all that makes a man."

What ear so dull as to be deaf to that noble music? What heart so numb as not to thrill with the charm of knightliness? Chivalry! it may be called the fairest flower of history, sprung from the root of that tree which Roman soldiers planted one day, high on Calvary. For as the source of knighthood is the Crusades, so the source of the Crusades is the cross.

That is what the word means. A crusade is a war for the cross. The sign of enlistment was not a cap and a row of buttons, it was a red cross on the right shoulder. Becoming a soldier-knight was in those days called the taking of the cross, *the taking of the cross*. Peter, the Hermit, on a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, had witnessed for himself the pollution of the holy places by blasphemous Mohametans, and secured per-

mission from the Patriarch of the East and the Pope of the West to announce these pollutions to all Christendom, with an appeal for redress and deliverance. Pope Urban II gave him the enthusiastic support of his influence and his eloquence. At Clermont, in the year 1095, the great orator addressed a vast concourse composed largely of proud knights, whose chief business had hitherto been plunder and feud. "Yea," he exclaimed, "the knighthood of Christ hath even plundered Christ's fold, exchanging the deeds of a knight for the works of night. As ye love your souls, now go forth boldly, and, quitting this mutual slaughter, take up arms for the household of faith. Christ himself will be your leader, as, more valiantly than did the Israelites of old, you fight for your Jerusalem. It will be a goodly thing to die in that city, where Christ died for you. Let not love of any earthly possession detain you. It were better to die in warfare than behold the evils that befall the holy places. Start upon the way to the holy sepulchre; wrench the land from the accursed race, and subdue it to yourselves. Thus shall you spoil your foes of their wealth and return home victorious, or else, purpled with your own blood, receive an everlasting reward." As the voice of the speaker died away, there went up one cry from the assembled host: "It is the will of God! It is the will of God!" "Then raising his eyes to heaven and stretching out his hand for silence, Urban renewed his speech with words of praise: 'This day hath been fulfilled in your midst the saying of our Lord,' "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them." Had not the Lord been in your midst, you would not thus have all uttered the same cry. Wherefore I tell you it is God who hath inspired you with His voice. So let the Lord's motto be your battle-cry, and when you go forth to meet the enemy this shall be your watchword: "It is the will of God! It is the will of God!"' "The multitudes flung themselves prostrate before the sign of the uplifted cross. Proud knights bent the knee, and even groveled in the dust, before the sign of Calvary, pledging with kisses and with vows their devotion unto death. On the right shoulder the insignia was affixed;

garments were destroyed that each might bear proudly on his shoulder the sign and seal of his undying devotion, even the red, the bloody cross. The Crusades were wars for the cross. The thought uppermost in the hearts of all re-awakened Europe at that time was this, and this alone: The Taking of the Cross.

What transformation is denoted by that phrase! The cross had been, but a few centuries before, the symbol of unutterable shame. Crucifixion was the lowest of deaths; men spoke of "the ignominious death of the cross," a death of peculiar shame, reserved for the lowest degraded criminals. Yet now, in those ages of the Crusades, it had become a badge of honor, worn proudly by the lordiest knights. It is a wonderful transformation—as though in our day men were to begin to paint the gallows upon their coats-of-arms. Think of what it means! A Jewish peasant bearing the common name of Jesus, had spent three years of his life in such away as to make even his own family say he was "beside himself." Deserted at the last even by his own chosen twelve, one of them delivered him into the hands of Roman soldiers, who mocked him, scourged him, slapped him, and spat in his face. His boasted crown turned out to be but a crown of thorns, plaited by the course thick fingers of some Roman guardsman. For his scepter, they put a reed into his hand. Then they knelt, with mocking laughter, and hailed him as a king. Silent, pale, helpless, he could not save himself. So the Roman soldiers crucified him, and speared him, and at the foot of his cross raffled away his garments. So died he: in perfect loneliness, utter defeat, and profoundest shamefulness. Yet, because of a rumor that spread abroad shortly after his death, people began to believe in him again, and a sect sprang up. This sect gained a following at length in Rome; because, as the citizen Tacitus bitterly confesses everything worthless and vile drifted to the capital. Nero burnt these fanatics. Trajan outlawed them. The gentle Aurelius did not scruple to murder them. Decius slew them wholesale. Diocletian and Galerius sought them out man by man, woman by woman, child by child, determined

that not one of the vermin should remain to corrupt the Roman State. Then, after two hundred and fifty years of this fierce and bloody work, the State rested in weary satisfaction and celebrated its victory.

But the next emperor is a Christian. He takes the eagles from his standards, and replaces them with crosses. The badge of shame becomes a sign of glory. He bids his Roman soldiers fight in the name of the crucified Jew. Roman soldiers bow the knee to Him whom Roman soldiers scourged. Again do they put a crown upon His head and a scepter in His hand, but not in scorn. Jesus is their King, above Cæsar. Galilee has conquered Rome. The empire becomes Christian by imperial decree. Christians, no longer wandering about in deserts or dwelling in the caves of the earth, drive in gilded chariots of state, becoming the most honored officers of the empire. They have exchanged their goat-skins for brocades, the purple of mourning for the purple of rule. The poor are rich, the debased are exalted, the vanquished are the victors. "Constantine the Defender" succeeds "Galerius the Butcher." The Crusaders did but follow Constantine when they took the cross; and millions since have followed the Crusaders in choosing as their highest, proudest symbol that which was, till Jesus died, the badge of shame. To-day it is the center of our noblest paintings. Women wear it pendant on their breasts. Plain men choose it as their single ornament. Our books are stamped with it. It gleams, gilded, from the summit of our noblest architecture. And always there dwells in this simple transverse figure a dignity and glory belonging to no other symbol known to man.

Why is it so? Why this remarkable transformation of an ancient gallows into a modern emblem of glory? Marvelous as it may seem, this is the simple reason: because that outlawed Jew did die thereon. Because this cross was the scaffold of the Man of Nazareth; because it upbore in death His suffering body, therefore it has become a symbol loved and adored and glorious. He it was that uplifted it. Because of Him who bore the cross did Roman emperors weave it with gold

upon their purple standards. And it was supreme devotion to Jesus Christ, a thousand years after He had died, and in the darkest of all ages since the black year of His death—it was supreme devotion to Him that led those millions of Crusaders to the taking of the cross. Let us seize this thought in all its full significance: the supreme attractiveness of that grand figure whose death could glorify a gallows! "I, if I be lifted up," said He, "will draw all men unto me." Superbly is that prophecy proved true. Hearts of iron have leaped irresistibly and forever unto Him, the Great Magnet. Thousands of earth's knightliest souls have taken the cross and followed Him.

Beginning with His own earliest disciples—what a splendid vision had the beloved John of the supreme kingliness of Jesus! "Behold a white horse! And He that is seated thereon is called Faithful and True, and in righteousness He doth judge and make war. His eyes are as a flaming fire, and on His head are many crowns—many crowns! And He hath a Name written, which no man knoweth, but He Himself. And He is clothed in a vesture dipped in blood; and His Name is called the Word of God. And the armies which are in heaven follow Him, upon white horses, clothed in fine linen, white and clean. And He hath on His vesture and on His thigh a Name written, King of kings and Lord of lords." Simple contact for three short years with this superb crucified King uplifted humble John the fisherman into John the rapt seer, the poet, and the saint. Think also of that other Gallilean fisherman; hard-handed, harsh, soiled with his unseemly trade, whose brittle character was transformed into the Rock of the Church through his apperception of the knightliness of Jesus: "Who," as Cephas cries with divine enthusiasm—"Who did no sin, neither was guile found in His mouth; Who, when He was reviled, reviled not again; when He suffered, He threatened not; but committed Himself to Him that judgeth righteously." So, by the firm yet gentle and supremely faithful knightliness of his Leader was this impetuous, uncouth and faithless fisherman transformed into one who was faithful to his Master even unto death, humbly requesting, when they led him, too, to be crucified, that they affix him to the cross head-

downwards, since he was not worthy even to die in the same manner as had His knightly Lord.

Ah, those white-clad heavenly armies of John's vision—those ascended followers of Jesus, who follow in their Master's train: see them as they march, that glorious cavalry, clothed in glistening linen, white and clean! Hear their shouts of supreme devotion to Him for whose sake they were led on earth to take the cross, whereas now in heaven they wear the crown. Leading that host of white-clad armies is the fine old chieftain of Tarsus, who fought a good fight, who kept the faith, and who went half regretfully (since to live was Christ) to the gain of the crown of righteousness, his need for the taking of the cross. Once he had despised that cross. But a single eye-to-eye vision of the kingly Christ transformed him from enemy to friend. Hear his devotion utter itself in angelic eloquence as he cries: "For I am persuaded that neither death nor life nor angels nor principalities nor powers nor things present nor things to come nor height nor depth nor any other creature shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord." "Unto this King eternal, immortal, invisible, the Only Wise God, be honor and glory for ever and ever!"

Out of those thousands voices of ascended knights a few dim echoes come to us. Hear Augustine's ascription of devotion to his Leader, as he cries: "O Truth who art Eternity! And Love who art Truth! And Eternity who art Love! Thou art my All, to Thee do I sigh night and day. When I first knew Thee, Thou liftedst me up, that I might see there was somewhat for me to see, and that I was not yet such as to see. And Thou streaming forth Thy beams of light upon me most strongly, didst beat back the weakness of my sight, and I trembled with love and awe: and I perceived myself to be far off from Thee in the region of unlikeness." And yet—"For Thyself Thou madest us; and our hearts are restless until they rest in Thee." There comes to us also the impassioned voice of the monk Bernard, who preached the Second Crusade: "If thou writest, nothing therein hath savor to me, unless I read Jesus in it. If thou discoursest, nothing there is agreeable to

me unless in it also 'Jesus' resounds. He is as honey in the mouth, a melody in the ear, a song of jubilee in the heart. He is our medicine as well. Is any among you saddened? Let Jesus enter into his heart, and thence leap to his lips, and lo! at the rising illumination of His name, every cloud flies away, serenity returns." Often are the words of this medieval monk on our lips as we sing,

"Jesus, the very thought of thee,
With sweetness fills my breast,
But sweeter far thy face to see,
And in thy presence rest."

Next we hear the peaceful prayer of the sweet German mystic, Thomas à Kempis: "Grant to me above all things that can be desired, to rest in Thee, and in Thee to have my heart at peace. Thou art the true peace of the heart, Thou its only rest; out of Thee all things are hard and restless. In this very peace, that is, in Thee, Thou One Chiefest Eternal Good, I will sleep and rest."

The turbulent Luther, whose words were "half-battles," turns for peace and soothing to the Gentle Cross-Bearer, whispering ever so gently to his heart, "Keep still and He will mould thee into the right shape." A hundred years later, we hear the consecrated voice of Francis de Sales pledging his will to Christ's in everything; "without reserve, without a 'but,' an 'if,' or a limit." Then Fénelon offers himself in total sacrifice with the words, "Smite, or heal; depress me, or raise me up; I adore all Thy purposes without knowing them; I am silent; I offer myself in sacrifice; I yield myself to Thee; I would have no other desire than to do Thy will." In our own time, there has lately entered into the company of that white-clad throng one who prayed, "O Lord, who art as the shadow of a great rock in a weary land, who beholdest thy weak creatures weary of labor, weary of pleasure, weary of hope deferred, weary of self; in thine abundant compassion, and unutterable tenderness, bring us, I pray thee, unto thy rest." And then the clear-eyed Christian poet of the South, Sidney Lanier; hear him, after he has set all of earth's greatest names beside the name of Jesus, how he cries with transcendent admiration,

"But Thee, but Thee, O sovereign seer of Time,
 But Thee, O poet's Poet, Wisdom's Tongue,
 But Thee, O man's best Man, O love's best Love,
 O perfect life in perfect labor writ,
 O all men's Comrade, Servant, King or Priest,
 What *if* or *yel*, what mole, what flaw, what lapse,
 What least defect or shadow of defect,
 What rumor, tattled by an enemy,
 Of inference loose, what lack of grace,
 Even in torture's grasp, or sleep's, or death's—
 Oh, what amiss may I forgive in Thee,
 Jesus, good Paragon, thou Crystal Christ?"

What a goodly company have followed Jesus in the taking of the cross! How many thousands of stainless knights have claimed Him as their leader! Truly, after this brief backward glance into the devotional history of the purest hearts that ever have throbbed on this old earth, we may sing with new understanding the words of that grand ancient hymn, the hymn of the valiant Crusaders themselves. As they marched on their venturous quest against His foes, the fair meadow-lands of France smiled to them of the gentle love of Christ, and the mighty German forests whispered of His majesty. In the dazzling Eastern sun that shone by day they saw His light, and in the silent wonders of the heavens by night they read His glory. To this terrible army with banners all created things did but speak of Him their Creator, Who was to them the Bright and Morning Star, the One Among Ten Thousand, and the Altogether Lovely. Thus it is that the music of this great "Crusaders' Hymn" rolls through the ages down to us, throbbing with the martial tread of the armies of the Lord of Hosts, pulsing with the heart's devotion of a myriad of Christian knights—

Beautiful Saviour! King of Creation,
 True Son of God and Son of Man!
 Truly I'd love Thee, truly I'd serve Thee,
 Knight of my soul, my Joy, my Crown!

Fair are the meadows, fairer the woodlands,
 Robed in the flowers of blooming spring;
 Jesus is fairer, Jesus is purer,
 He makes our sorrowing spirits sing.

Fair is the sunshine, fairer the moonlight,
And all the sparkling stars on high ;
Jesus shines brighter, Jesus shines purer,
Than all the angels in the sky.

Beautiful Saviour ! King of Creation !
True Son of God and Son of Man !
Glory and honor, praise, adoration,
Now and forevermore be Thine.

ARTICLE V.

A PAROUSIA INTERROGATION.

BY REV. M. COOVER, A.M.

There is a natural desire to be an undeluded witness of a trustworthy fulfilment of prophecy. The privilege of immediately satisfying such a wish is given to any one that is patient enough to examine a query of Jesus and weigh the evidence. The query is finding its implied negative answer as fulfilment not in the conduct and disbelief of the unregenerate world alone, but in the exegesis and dogmatic treatment of the Bible record by avowed teachers and followers of Christ. This query of Jesus, the answer to which is being so strangely yet perceptibly realized in Christendom, is the question appended to the parable of the Unjust Judge : "Howbeit when the Son of Man cometh shall he find the faith on the earth ?"* The parable seems to teach nothing more than the lesson taught by the parable of the ungrateful Friend at Midnight. But the keynote of the parable is found in the last verse, which differentiates this parable significantly from the lesson of importunity addressed to the disciples in the parable of the unsympathetic friend. A poor woman whose rights are invaded by some rascal, and who is unable to maintain herself against his encroachments, appeals to the common public judge for defence of her property or her claims. But he is as much a villain as her adversary, and she gets no redress for her wrongs. The woman,

* Luke 18 : 8.

however, continues her application until the judge grows tired of her petitions, and jokingly says, "I will avenge her of her adversary lest she come and hit me under the eye." "Hear what the unjust judge saith," Jesus now remarks to his disciples. This villain at last yields to a poor helpless woman; "And shall not God avenge his own elect, which cry day and night unto him, though he bear long with them?" And then he adds: "Howbeit when the Son of Man cometh, shall he find the faith on the earth?"

But what has this remark to do with the parable? If God's elect continue crying day and night unto him through years of refusal or retarded answer, they must manifest a large measure of faith. Spasmodic prayer is consonant with want of true faith; but ceaseless petition regards God as interested in human need and welfare and reveals a reposed confidence in God's ability and final willingness to help. And yet in respect of a time, when the cries and yearnings, the ceaseless fervent prayers of believing humanity, are rising up to a trusted God, Jesus asks, "When the Son of Man cometh, shall he find the faith on the earth?"

But it is *the* faith; it is the definite article that gives this faith a peculiar significance. Righteousness will not have ceased on the earth; faith in God, and in his Son as the world's Redeemer, will not have died out when the Son of Man cometh. It is *faith in his real coming again* for the consummation of his kingdom and the judicative reparation of all wrongs that shall wane and disappear. In the long list of commentaries from Meyer to Plummer this passage is spoken of faintly. The former thinks it is dread lest the faith in Jesus as Messiah shall become obsolete. The latter is at sea in regard to the passage. Goebel, in *The Parables of Jesus*, teaches that faith in the final redemption will be weakened by the times of tribulation. Bruce, in *The Parabolic Teaching of Christ*, suggests that faith in God's providence will have all but died out.

But in *The Expositor's Greek Testament*, Bruce at last comes to this statement expressed in one brief sentence: "Not absolutely, but in reference to the second coming, hope deferred making the heart sick."

While men are growing in spiritual susceptibility, and their characters are making a rich appropriation of Christian virtues, the idea will prevail that the moral order will continue this way forever. They will be forgetful of something Jesus deemed important, forgetful that the Son of Man will yet come to effect a finality, to consummate his kingdom. The disciples possessed irrepressible faith in the coming of Christ during their life time. Yet among the many that believed in an early parousia and lived in this eager anticipation were some that began to doubt. Jesus had not left them more than a quarter of a century till men began to say, "Where is the promise of his coming, for since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of creation." Paul taught watchfulness for the parousia, but not a Chiliasm. There was to be no realization of a perfected kingdom on earth. It was not an earthly utopia that he presented as a parousia-doctrine; no realistic eschatology after the symbolism of John's Apocalypse. To the Thessalonians, grieving over their dead who failed to survive to the expected coming of Jesus, Paul wrote the comforting assurance that those who were living at the time of the parousia would not precede the beloved dead, and added this significant statement, that the living must be changed. There must be a transmutation of the physical to the spiritual for entrance into a supersensible kingdom. The perspective of the future saw events that must intervene before the end, but no definite and orderly history with concluding events as a known foreclosure to the world era. There were no cataclysmic indications, no unmistakable foretokens to men in the era of Christ's first advent. Scientific evidence for a divine consummation of all things, physical or social portents presaging with undoubted surety a finality to this world's history, are not to be expected. But a consummation is a biblical assurance. Jesus had no foreboding that righteousness and faith in him as Messiah would cease as a preliminary to his return. But Jesus has not yet come, and is not expected; and when he does come he will find this the prevailing opinion still. It is not what the biblical record teaches, but what from present indications we think it ought to teach, that has become the criterion

of eschatology. The doctrine concerning the last things is one of the most difficult subjects for Biblical Theology. The scientific method of dealing with Christianity is bringing religious life under the general law of natural development. The worth of moral striving is not to include any attained goal of perfection, for that would be the final elimination of all forthreach of the will. The *summum bonum* does not consist in perfection, but in becoming. We are told not to regard the future good of man as a state of complete fulness, for the result of that would be a cessation of all volitional forthreach, an imperturbable, inane calm. The true value of life is its content of progress. End there is none; and the significance of the game of existence is not to be found in the goal, but in the playing of the game. The good is not to be found in perfection, but in process. There is no worth in the ends delusively sought, for attainment means stagnation. A realized goal is a meaningless, superfluous dream. Moral perfection or degradation reaching its ultimate ushers in a time described by Browning, when

"Man's face finds no more play or action
But joy, that is crystalized forever,
Or grief, an eternal petrification."

Perfection attained is followed by dissolution. The matured flower, the ripened fruit, decays. "What's come to perfection perishes."

A maturing purpose, however, differs slightly from a ripening plum; and an attained moral perfection doubtless follows a career different from a matured tuberose. When analogies are made to go on all fours, truth is made to sacrifice something of the intellectual and spiritual to give place to the animal. Is the consummation of the kingdom ever to be a realized fact? or is it only a progressive dream, a symbol of development without finality? No one can consistently study the New Testament and build up a Biblical Theology without recognizing a consummation. Most biblical scholars teach a consummation, but leave no room for it. The statements concerning the parousia find themselves wondrously distorted. In the

sifting of the biblical material the teaching of the New Testament is spiritually sublimated, and consummation becomes a mathematical surd. But even evolutionary teaching admits of world-dissolutions. It is not the believer in a consummation of all things that has the short view of organic process, but the short-sighted disciple of goalless endeavor, who is so steeped in process as to be unconscious of any *terminus ad quem*.

The fluctuating opinions and hypotheses of both physical and religious science, the utter materialization of the world, on the one hand, and the ultra-spiritual sublimation of it, on the other, create a feverish unrest. And the sad "unrest of the world" is doubtless due to the fact that science has not found her God.

The law of organic development and of social environment creates a historic explanation of Jesus. But as organic evolution knows no intrusion of the supernatural into the realm of matter, or into the forces of human character, the supersensible element must somehow be eliminated from the personality and power of Jesus. The historic conception should not be mongrel, but pure and consistent. Natural forces account for the supposedly superhuman.

Weiss, in his *Biblical Theology of the New Testament*, I, § 33, and *The Life of Christ*, III, 92, conceives the mind of Jesus to have been prepossessed by conceptions derived from the form of Old Testament prophecy, which lacked true perspective, commencement and consummation being viewed as one. Progressive development which lies between beginning and end was overlooked, and the fulfilment was closely connected with the incipient movement of history. But Weiss neglects to observe the fact that Old Testament prophecy knew nothing of a second coming of the Messiah. It announced but one parousia. The conception of a second advent is one peculiar to Jesus, and the New Testament development. The mind of Jesus in its prevision was not limited or restrained by Old Testament prophecy. Jesus transcends the perceptions and predictions of the Old Testament prophets, and both foresees and teaches development before consummation. More keenly

than Weiss, Beyschlag, in his *New Testament Theology*, I, 1901, says of the prevision of Jesus, "The indefinite point extends into a line in which a beginning and an end with something lying between may be distinguished. In other words, Jesus comprehended the realization of the kingdom of God, which is generally represented by the prophets as momentary, like a flash of lightning, rather as a process of growth, a historical development; and according to the same law he consciously viewed also the future completion of his work as a course of history, achieved not in a single act, but in an advancing series of acts."

It is to be admitted that Jesus suffered limitations to his divine power in becoming true man. There was voluntary and essential self-emptying to become one with us. But when this limitation is made to influence his teaching to the extent of contracting his spiritual conceptions, and of narrowly circumscribing his qualifications as a religious guide within the illiberal circles of Jewish education and preconception, we have an invalidated Christ. The moderate limitations of Jesus' prevision set by Weiss soon run into the extreme humanistic confines of knowledge expressed by Schwartzkopff in chapter IV of *The Prophecies of Jesus Christ*. The contracted mind of Jesus permits of no comprehension capable of authoritative teaching. His dependence on natural education, and on the ideas of others, renders him incompetent to express independent and authoritative judgment in respect of things supersensible.

Wendt, in *The Teaching of Jesus*, II, 343ff., says of this concluding verse of the parable that it "seems like that of a pessimistic doubt on the part of Jesus as to the permanent continuance of the success of his messianic work on earth." Jesus was self-deceived as to the immediateness of his parousia. He had no consciousness that its nearness was only apparent and perspective. His conception that the earthly conclusion of his kingdom was comparatively near was out of correspondence with the real circumstances. And to overcome this offence at the ignorance of Jesus we are to bear in mind the "psychological presupposition" that Jesus was free from speculations as to the

time of his coming, and of the transition of the kingdom from its earthly state to its heavenly perfection, confessing to know neither the day nor the hour. But in attempting to penetrate the psychological state of Jesus, Wendt voluntarily fails to discern the significance of this verse, and calmly overlooks several of the most distinctive parables of Jesus. The whole field of evidence is not taken in, and the mind of the Master is not seen in its fulness.

While Jesus' followers were walking on the clouds of ecstatic expectancy believing that the kingdom was immediately to appear, Jesus, at short intervals, delivers the parables of the Pounds and of the Talents. Amid the fervor of popular expectation of immediate glory, Jesus on his last journey from Jericho to Jerusalem, tells the multitude that as a nobleman he is going to visit his suzerain to receive the investiture of a kingdom; but a great deal of merchandizing is to be done before his return. And on Mount Olivet, to the eager inquiry of the disciples as to the coming of the kingdom, he describes himself as a traveler going into a far country, who gives to his servants all his property to do business with; and it is a long time till the Lord of those servants cometh. Preceding the parable of the Pounds the disciples and general followers of Jesus are all *qui vive* for an immediate and glorious consummation. The kingdom is surely imminent. The rich young ruler makes all haste to secure his *quid boni*. James and John deem it expedient at once to present their candidacy for high office. But Jesus is calm and collected. There is no mental confusion. There is no need of haste on the part of his followers. There will be ample time to cool and settle, to correct errors of opinion and expectation; time for the aspirations of the ambitious to be reformed, and for men to conceive new purposes and be elevated by noble pursuits. The malice of the captious and disaffected will have capacious opportunity to vent itself. Privileged embassies may be dispatched to the suzerain to resist the rights of investiture.

Subsequently to the parable of the Pounds an occasion called from Jesus an exhortation to live in an attitude of watchful-

ness for his return. The expectancy of the disciples was to be keen, their alertness intelligently active, a readiness symbolized with lamp in hand well-provisioned with oil. In the parable of the Virgins he taught the disciples the spirit of proper waiting. "Watch, therefore," he said, "for ye know neither the day nor the hour wherein the Son of Man cometh."

But Jesus well knew the mind of his followers, how expectant they were of a very speedy coming, and followed his instructions concerning waiting with a parable which inculcated the necessity of working while they waited. The thought of Christ's speedy coming made the near future pregnant with glorious anticipations. So intense was this spirit that a discount was put on the present, and hearts were quickly palpitating with the happy expectation of what was about to be. This attitude, pensive of the future, and listless of the present, was becoming the prevailing temperament. It was deeply felt and plainly manifested subsequently by the Thessalonian Christians to whom Paul preached.

The expectancy of Jesus' speedy return annulled the value of present life. Men left their employment and walked about aimlessly awaiting the early appearance of their Lord. When Paul learned of it he rebuked their conduct, and told them to improve their time: "For we hear," he said, "that there are some which walk among you disorderly, working not at all, but are busybodies. Now them that are such we command and exhort by our Lord Jesus Christ, that with quietness they work, and eat their own bread." These watchful, loquacious busybodies were encroaching on the hospitality of others, and absorbing others' time in waiting for their Lord. Their lamps were in readiness for the Bridegroom, but their days were passed in unoccupied waiting, the prolongation of which was becoming socially and industriously disastrous.

They were errorists not in the expectation of the coming of Jesus, but in the idleness of waiting. This is just what Jesus foresaw as the result of a one-sided view of truth, and added as a corrective the parable of the Talents. The spirit of expectancy was not to annul the duty of industrial activity.

They were not to stand lamp in hand, but to set it on a lamp-stand and go to work. When he came they were to be found at the mill, and in the field, as well as on the house-top.

Differing from the Synoptists, John, in his gospel, associates the second coming chiefly with the dispensation of the Spirit. Jesus in his bodily absence will be present to his disciples as Holy Spirit, who is his *alter ego*, not merely to act as Comforter of orphans, but to be an advocate, a lawyer, to plead and defend Christ's cause. He will be with them alway to empower them to disciple nations, and to teach them to observe the things which make qualified citizens, and moral worth for his kingdom. John's teaching thus accords with the conclusion of Matthew's gospel. The parousia in John's gospel is not sublimated into a mere spiritual dispensation. Jesus is going away, but to prepare a place for his own. He will come again that where he is there they may be also. There is no haste, nor is there wanting a prevision of a consummation. His coming as Advocate does not exclude his parousia as judge. There is in John a *last day* from which the idea of consummation cannot be wholly eliminated.

Yet a smile of incredulity plays on the countenance of the critic. This showing of evidence by grouping the sayings of Jesus is mere fustian. The traditional conception of a parousia is sublime nonsense. The array of Scriptural evidence is only an air-castle which falls before the more comprehensive criticism of the gospels. Stevens, in *The Theology of the New Testament*, p. 159f., makes a radical sundering of these parables from any teaching whatever pertaining to the parousia.

"The parable of the Unjust Judge," he says, "which expressly purports to teach the certainty that prayer will be answered, is allegorized by Luke and applied to teach watchfulness in view of the Lord's second coming. We, therefore, see in this discourse traces of the tendency to apply to the idea of a final parousia sayings and parables whose form and content do not naturally yield themselves to such an application. In like manner, I cannot but regard it as improbable

that the parable of the Pounds or Talents originally referred to the parousia. * * * A candid review of the passages appears to me to leave no room for doubt that all three Synoptists have applied to a final coming sayings of Christ which could not have been originally intended to refer to that event. Exegesis must, indeed, maintain that the passages in their present form relate to that subject, but criticism—which is only a name for a more comprehensive estimate of the facts—cannot regard this reference at any rate in most instances as the original one." This is the weakest passage in Professor Stevens' work; for in it he avowedly sunders exegesis from Biblical Theology.

The Synoptists then have misrepresented Jesus' teaching. The gospels are adaptations to the preconceptions and predilections of their authors; chronicles of traditional anticipations; the outcome of the ecstatic glorification of Messianic dreams. The record does not contain facts, but a faulty interpretation of facts. We do not have a factual Christ, but an eclectic interpretation of him. The gospels are not durable in the light of the more comprehensive criticism. Their absolute truth is now undiscoverable, and their statements are usable only by very careful postulates. The Synoptists and the authors of their logia or records were honest men, but the bias of their predilections led them into a series of artless errors.

They either misconceived or misinterpreted the sayings of Jesus, and there is no getting back of their preconceptions to establish convincing truth. There is only one answer possible to this kind of reasoning; and that is the negation of silence. When the critic makes his statement from predilection of personal opinion, and then creates his own evidence to support it, there is no basis for argument. The sundering of exegesis from theology, the sifting and superseding of Biblical records by superior judgment titled a "more comprehensive estimate of the facts," makes a pretence of reaching facts without a record. The whole body of such development rests on subjectiveness.

Gilbert, in *The Revelation of Jesus*, chap. VII, spiritualizes the whole content of the parousia. He classifies the state-

ments of the last things under two heads; *the coming on the clouds of heaven*, and *the coming with the angels*; the former refers to the Jerusalem era of destruction; the latter is a "figurative announcement of a grand luminous *Finis* at the bottom of the last page of earthly history." It is not clear whether a real *finis* is meant, or a symbol of an endlessly progressing economy of glory. The idea of a consummation is but a rhetorical climax, an intricately subscribed, but faintly legible, colophon, marking a conclusion of history as far as it can be symbolized. It follows the bent of Ritschl, who, in his system of theological development, makes a complete rejection of eschatology. Christianity is a service to humanity, and its keynote is "Altruism." The interests of the kingdom are pre-eminently earthly and social. "He shall come to judge the quick and the dead" is a buried tenet of belief.

These forms of doctrinal development cryptically pave the way to an idealism of the subjectively pantheistic type. There is a religious idealism being taught by our metaphysicians to which Christianity is unconsciously allying itself, an idealism in which, for a religious end, God ceases to be an undivided object and becomes an experience. The soul finds immediate union and communion with God. Man is suffered without reproof to rise above reason, not to rest on faith, but to interpenetrate God, to become part of the consciousness of the Absolute. Professor Royce, in his concluding *Gifford Lecture* says, "*We need not conceive the Ethical Individual, however partial he may be, as in any sense less in the grade of complication of his activity or in the multitude of his acts of will than is the Absolute*" (italics Prof. Royce's.) God ceases to be unique and indivisible, and allows or plans man's rise into the participation of the divine essence. We need to heed the warning of Plotinus that when man tries to rise above reason, he falls outside it. When God's immanence entirely absorbs man, evil becomes part of God's good. Pantheism always becomes detectable by its aspects of the fact of sin.

It must make room for evil as a phase of good. As dirt is

merely "matter misplaced," so evil is "misplaced good," or "good in the making."

There is then no judgment to be feared; no sifting of character for the separation of the good from the evil; no parousia in the biblical sense; and no judicatory consummation. We all are divine. We all share absolute ethical harmony with God. The trend is patent. No Jesus need be looked for in the future, for the Jesus of the past is not the one we so long dreamed him to be, since the pious disquisitions of his ecstatic followers concerning him are the delusions of false ideas, the preconceptions of a realistic, unspiritual age. Modern prophet and priest, philosopher and religious teacher, express no faith in a Christ coming to consummate his kingdom. Before our eyes is a present-day fulfilment of prophecy; verily, "when the Son of Man cometh, shall he find the faith on the earth?"

ARTICLE VI.

BIBLE AND PULPIT.

BY REV. WILLIAM KELLY.

The Bible is an indispensable adjunct to the Christian pulpit, its teachings and principles being the basis on which the latter stands. Other volumes may be carried into the sacred desk: this book must be used in the pulpit. The desk from which it is excluded ceases to be Christian.

The clergyman should be a man of wide reading, research and breadth of information. He should enrich his mind with treasures of knowledge gathered from every conceivable field of scholarship, and the result of his literary explorations may be clearly manifested in his thought, style, and expression; but he is not a true minister of Christ, qualified to address a congregation on the doctrines of Christian belief, unless his principal study is the Word of God. No breadth of scholarship along philosophical, theological or ethical lines can be substituted for an acquaintance with God's Word. The strong preachers of the centuries, not those who created an ephemeral *furor*, but

scholars who left the stamp of their genius on the life, thought and sentiment of the Church, as an abiding force, were not men who drew their inspiration mainly from the early fathers—the philosophies of Aristotle, Plato or Zeno, from Bernard, Bonaventure or Aquinas—they were men who made the Bible their touchstone, dug golden nuggets from its exhaustless mine, selected their weapons from its well-stocked arsenals, and drank deep and long from its fountains of truth. The more we study the lives of the great Christian orators during the Apostolic, Patristic, Medieval, Reformation, and Modern periods, the more we are convinced of the power of God's Word and the more we are impressed with the fact that the Bible is the true source of thought, instruction and eloquence, from which the pulpit must be supplied. The very design of the establishment of the Christian ministry shows that the Bible is for the pulpit and the pulpit for the Bible. The divine command, "Go ye therefore and make disciples of all the nations" led to the establishment of the pulpit as an essential part of Christian teaching, instituted with the design that living men might use it to proclaim the Gospel and publish the Law.

But to do this efficiently, the occupant of the pulpit must use the Bible as his constant companion and text-book. In the wideness of its scope as a book for the ministry of the entire Church, the Bible occupies a unique position. In the study and practice of Law, each nation has its own text-books; the same is true of medicine and other branches of knowledge, but as a standard of authority the Bible stands alone, the single authorized religious standard for the entire Christian world. If it be said there are Creeds and Confessions that are also authoritative, as the Apostolic and Nicene Creeds, the Augsburg and other Confessions, we admit the truth of the statement, which simply establishes our contention, for the Creeds and Confessions named are only authoritative because they draw their inspiration from the Word of God.

There are manifest advantages that accrue to him who in his pulpit ministrations appeals persistently to the authority of this book, for deny the question of authority as we may, there

must be an authoritative standard somewhere, if the pulpit is to deal efficiently with the problems of life. The professor in the classroom must speak with authority or the students will despise his instructions. The physician must give his remedies as though conscious of their worth, or he will lose the confidence of patients, and the clergyman must speak with assurance, or the pulpit will lose its influence.

The biblical preacher is always sure of his ground; entrenched on God's Word, he stands, not on the boggy quagmire of idle speculation or uncertain conjecture, but on the firm and stable rock of assured and immutable truth. This consciousness invests him with a courage and an assurance he would not otherwise possess—a confidence that is in itself an inspiration—takes possession of his own mind and reacts on the minds of his hearers. Believing that the verses he reads to his audience, from the Word, are emanations from the wisdom of the Infinite Mind, that the sentences he expounds from Holy Writ are Spirit and Life to the devout and attentive hearer, that the message he proclaims is the living word of truth, the Bible instructor, who, in the language of Watts—

"Preaches as if he ne'er would preach again,
And as a dying man to dying men,"

is, unconsciously to himself, clothed with an air of authority, tempered with mildness, such as should characterize the ambassador of Him whose teachings astonished the multitude and "whose Word was with power." Nearly every Christian minister can testify to the discomfort, uncertainty, and uneasiness that possessed him when, drawing his inspiration from Plato, Kant, Mill or Spencer, he stood before his audience, and of the sudden bracing of the mind and confidence of assurance that came to him when discarding the brittle arguments of metaphysics and philosophy, he held aloft the naked sword of the Spirit, crying, "Thus saith the Lord!"

We do not believe the influence of the Bible is on the wane. We do not think it is in danger of becoming obsolete. In no era of the world's history was it more widely circulated, or in

greater demand than it is to-day, and it is a well-known fact that the preachers who have attracted the largest audiences in recent times, were men who regarded the Bible as the very Word of God. Spurgeon and Parker in England, Moody in America, Stocker in Germany, Gavazzi in Italy, Monod in France, and others scarcely less eminent, were biblical preachers in the best sense of the term.

But what part of the Bible should be employed in the ministrations of the pulpit is a pertinent question? In some quarters the notion seems to prevail that the New Testament alone is worthy a place in the sacred desk, that the Old Testament has become antiquated, that it has accomplished its mission, that it may be referred to as a volume of archaeology, history, poetry, customs, or reference, but that its practical religious value is at an end. Personally we hold that the Bible for the pulpit is not a partial and emasculated fragment, but the completed volume of the Gospel and the Law—the New as well as the Old, the Old as well as the New. There can be no doubt the expurgating tendency shown by many in their treatment of the Bible has tended to the serious injury of religion.

Everyone remembers the story of the man who had what he called "The Minister's Bible." His Pastor asked him what he meant by that, and received the reply, "I have sat five years under your ministry and have used this Bible. When you say anything is not authentic I cut it out. I have already cut out the Books of Job and Revelation and a great deal more beside." The minister tried to get the Bible from the parishoner, but failed, and meanwhile the process of elimination went on until one day the man returned from church with the cover under his arm—all that was left of his minister's Bible. This story, of course, is largely overdrawn, and yet it contains an element of truth. In too many quarters, men with superficial pretensions to learning, imagine they can best show the validity of their claim of scholarship by mutilating the Holy Scriptures. Persons who have never been heard of outside their pulpits or classrooms have been foisted into notoriety because of their attacks on the Word of God, leading others to

suppose that they, also, by similar methods might possibly emerge from obscurity to fame. There is considerable force in the sarcastic doggerel :

"Let us then be up, and doing
Things unorthodox each day,
Ripping Gospels up, and strewing
Old beliefs along the way.
Be not like dumb, driven cattle—
That would be a foolish crime,
Flout the Holy Bible, that, ll
Make you famous every time."

The unfortunate tendency to mutilate the Word of God should be assiduously guarded against. The Christian Minister should not forget the honor the Great Teacher put on the Old Testament when he said, "Ye searched the Scriptures, because ye think that, in them, ye have eternal life ; and these are they which bear witness of me." And again when he exclaimed, "If they hear not Moses and the Prophets neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead"—words spoken by the Master, when the canon of Scripture was the Old Testament only.

But while the Old Testament will always be used in pulpit ministrations, for the Law is still a school-master leading to Christ, the New Testament, especially, is the pulpit text-book. Here are found the precepts of Him who declared, "The Words I speak unto you are Spirit and Life." Here are contained the clearest expositions of the great Christian doctrines ; the institution of the sacraments ; the life, character, teaching, and sacrifice of our Lord ; the first history of the establishment and extension of the Christian Church ; the Pauline and other Epistles, so rich in thought and fruitful in instruction ; and the Revelation of coming events when He who is the King of kings will take His power and reign !

The Bible will always be needed in the pulpit ; the skeptic, the scoffer, the so-called higher critic may affirm it has seen its best days, that its teachings are antiquated, its precepts obsolete, its influence on the wane ; they may tell us that some new

Gospel of ethical science will eventually supersede it in the pulpit and pew ; but such assertions do not alarm the student of Church history. They have frequently been made in other centuries. Systems of thought have been exploited in the past with much gush, plausibility and assurance ; some of these systems their authors and adherents confidently predicted would destroy the authority and influence of the Word, but the Bible still lives ; its power increases ; its influence extends ; and in the light of its past record those who revere it as the very Word of God, who remember the prediction, "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but My Word shall not pass away," as well as the words of the inspired prophet "The grass withereth, the flower fadeth, but the Word of our God shall stand forever"—those who hold, on the authority of Christ himself, that as long as the world remains, sinful men in need of salvation will continue to esteem and revere the Book and insist on its continuance as the true pulpit standard of instruction, and that, until the moment comes when the Night of Time shall be lost in the Dawn of Eternity, the Divine command will be given and obeyed, "Go stand in the temple and speak unto the people all the words of this life." Such persons believe the philosophies of the present may be superseded as other philosophical systems have been ; that the science of the present may pass as other systems have vanished ; that the legislation of to-day may disappear before the influence of wiser and more equitable laws ; that social revolutions may overturn the present systems of civilization, order and government as preceding systems have been destroyed—but they also believe that God is not only in, but back of, the Bible and that the Divine Power is pledged to maintain the perpetuity of the Book.

It is held by certain so-called Liberals that the pulpit should be free ; that its occupants should present their individual ethical views and select their own text-books ; such men affirm that to require the use of the Bible in the pulpit is a restraint of individual liberty and tends to narrowness. In the sense that the Bible in the pulpit tends to the exclusion of false and pernicious teachings, injurious to the intellects, morals and con-

sciences of men, that it safeguards the pulpit, throwing around it needful and wholesome moral and spiritual restraints, investing it with a legitimate and wise narrowness that is a blessing to the souls of men, this charge is true—but to affirm that the use of the Bible makes the pulpit narrow, in any other than the holiest and wisest sense, is a slanderous charge against the teachings of the Book that points to moral and spiritual freedom by proclaiming to mankind the perfect law of liberty.

The Bible in the pulpit tends to shut out license, scepticism and the vagaries of science, falsely so called, but there is not one solitary truth in real science, philosophy, nature, art, poetry, history, or literature which may not be used by the Christian minister to sustain, unfold, expand and amplify the teachings of the Word. With the Bible in the pulpit, the preacher is strong; without it he is weak—hence when men point him to the resources of philosophy and literature, as a substitute for the Word, his answer is akin to the reply of David when the hardy stripling, rejecting the armor of Saul, exclaimed, "I have not proved it." Every true Christian pulpit will be provided with a copy of the Bible; every true Christian minister, no matter what may be the name of the denomination to which he belongs, will go to this Book for his facts and principles, his doctrines and inferences.

It was the writer's privilege to be present at the unveiling of the Luther monument in the City of Washington, in the year 1884. The splendid bronze figure of the great Reformer standing on its granite base, was draped with American flags, shrouding it from view, but when at an appropriate part of the ceremony the cords were pulled and the coverings fell from the colossal form, the assembled multitude looked on the statue of Luther, standing erect, one hand supporting the open Bible, the other placed upon it, and the face upturned. So should the Christian minister, with upturned face, invoking God's blessing on His message, enter the pulpit, open reverently the Bible, and proclaim fearlessly, boldly, and earnestly, to the congregation the precepts and principles of God's Word, exclaiming as he does so, "Thus saith the Lord!"

ARTICLE VII.

PETER'S THOUGHT OF THE CROSS.

BY REV. R. B. PEERY, PH.D.

The cross of Jesus is highly honored to-day. It crowns our most beautiful and costly buildings, decorates our polished marble shafts, and, overlaid with gold and jewels, is worn as a highly prized ornament on our bosoms. It is the world-wide mark of that merciful organization which has done so much to lessen the pain and horror of battle, the Red Cross Society. So often has this symbol been associated in our minds with all that is purest and best in life that we have come to think the shape of the cross itself artistically beautiful. The average man to-day seldom looks upon this holy sign without having his soul stirred by noble thoughts of self-sacrifice and love.

But it was not always so. Before the Prince of Glory hung upon that tree and forever glorified it, it was the "accursed tree," the symbol of a base felon's death. It stood for the lowest form of execution known to the Roman world. So shameful was it thought to be that a Roman citizen, no matter how vile his crime, could not be subjected to its ignominy; it was reserved as a special humiliation and disgrace to be visited upon condemned foreigners and slaves. Translated into modern speech, it represents that word which we hardly dare speak in polite society—the gallows. Just as death by hanging means infamy and disgrace, not only to the miserable offender but to his relatives as well, and especially to his children, so did the cross mean supreme contempt and disgrace. It signified to the ancient world just what the gallows does to the modern.

The disciples of Jesus naturally held this view of it, and shrank from contact with the cross with intense hatred and loathing. So strong was their feeling that Jesus dared not tell them of his approaching ignominy until late in his life, and even then he always hastened to connect the idea with his

resurrection glory. And although Christ gradually and cautiously introduced this coming fact to them, and dwelt upon its necessity, they were not able to understand it, nor to receive it. There was too great a contradiction in their minds between the glory and majesty of the expected Messiah and a low criminal's death to admit of any reconciliation. Therefore, when Jesus told them that he should be delivered up to the Gentiles, and mocked, and scourged, and spit upon, and killed, we read that they understood none of those things. It was not until after the resurrection that they were able to bear the idea of the cross; and not until very much later were they able to understand its full meaning.

We have data for tracing the gradual development of Peter's idea of the cross, and in this paper we purpose to trace that development. And in his attitude toward the cross Peter may well be taken as a representative of the other disciples, as their thought is not likely to have been in advance of his.

I. The first stage of Peter's thought that we wish to consider is that which he occupied when with his Lord in the flesh. His idea at that time is clearly shown in his attitude when Christ made the first formal announcement of his approaching sufferings and death to the twelve at Caesarea Philippi. We read in Matt. 16 : 21, 22, "*From that time began Jesus to show unto his disciples how that he must go unto Jerusalem, and suffer many things of the elders and chief priests and scribes, and be killed, and the third day be raised up. And Peter took him, and began to rebuke him, saying, Be it far from thee, Lord; this shall never be unto thee.*" He flatly refused to believe Jesus' announcement, and failed utterly to comprehend its necessity. The idea of a suffering Messiah was no part of his thought or expectation. With the whole body of his race he had overlooked the Messianic prophecies which refer to the humiliation and death of the coming King, or had explained away their natural meaning, and was looking only for a powerful, conquering Messiah, far removed from all suffering and pain. Many of the old prophets had referred to his humiliation and death, but their words had been explained otherwise. Espe-

cially had Isaiah foretold that he should be "*led as a lamb to the slaughter,*" but the Jews understood him not. And Peter and his brethren, in following Jesus, had no other thought than that he would, in the flesh, finally triumph over all his foes, and set up a glorious visible kingdom, again establishing in all its glory the magnificent throne of David and of Solomon. For this purpose they conceived that the Messiah had come; but for some inexplicable reason he was not yet exercising his kingly power, and they were constantly astonished at it. Even the Baptist seer, seeing Jesus' humble and lowly course, was caused to doubt, and sent to ask if he really were the Messiah. Down to the very last the twelve still maintained this conception of the King, and expected him at the critical moment to confound his enemies and show forth his power and glory. And when he did not do this they were so surprised and disappointed that they all forsook him and fled.

There were two points in which the disciples entirely failed to understand their Lord until after his resurrection and ascension; and these were, the Nature of His Kingdom, and the Necessity for his Death. After all his teaching about the Kingdom, and striking parables illustrating its nature, they still failed to comprehend his meaning; and so on the very morning of his ascension we hear them asking him, "*Dost thou now at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?*" That his Kingdom was a spiritual kingdom, and that it had already come in his own person, and was quietly developing in their midst, they could not realize. Neither could they appreciate the necessity for his death. That he was to be perfected through suffering, and that his humiliation had a vital connection with his saving work, were thoughts far from their minds. Rather, to them the cross was a stumbling-block, a frustration of his designs, a falsifying of his claims.

For this reason when Peter came into actual contact with the cross he recoiled, doubted, stumbled, and fell. The others were so stunned that they forsook him and fled; but Peter, with a wild conflict of emotions, followed afar off; and in the hour of his fierce trial failed miserably. In this first period then, the

cross was to Peter a stumbling-block and rock of offense, the frustration of the Master's work, and the destruction of his own hope—a misunderstood and a hated thing.

II. In the years immediately succeeding the resurrection and ascension of Jesus we find the second stage in the development of Peter's thought. Although far from grasping the clear and full truth, he has advanced beyond his former position, and is able to follow the mind of the Master further into this mystery.

Peter's chief thought concerning the crucifixion at this time was that it had been a great and heinous crime, the evil effects of which God had frustrated by raising up Jesus from the dead. In his address in the first chapters of Acts he always refers to it as such, and urges the Jews to repent of it in order that they might escape the swift judgments of God. In Acts 2 : 22-23 we read, "*Ye men of Israel, hear these words : Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God unto you by mighty works and wonders and signs, which God did by him in the midst of you, even as ye yourselves know ; him, being delivered up by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye by the hand of lawless men did crucify and slay.*" Later, standing in Solomon's porch, he spoke to the people thus, "*The God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob, the God of our fathers, hath glorified his servant Jesus ; whom ye delivered up, and denied before the face of Pilate, when he had determined to release him. But ye denied the Holy and Righteous One, and asked for a murderer to be granted unto you, and killed the Prince of Life, whom God raised from the dead*" (Acts 3 : 13-15). And again from the 17th verse, "*And now brethren I wot that in ignorance ye did it, as did also your rulers. But the things which God foreshewed by the mouth of all the prophets that his Christ should suffer he thus fulfilled. Repent, therefore, and turn again, that your sins may be blotted out, that so there may come seasons of refreshing from the presence of the Lord.*"

These passages show Peter's main conception of the cross at that time to have been that it was a great crime, for which the Jewish nation was responsible before God. The other disciples doubtless looked upon it in much the same way.

But Peter had progressed far enough to see that this sad event was in accord with prophecy. It had been clearly foretold, and should have been expected by them. In this Pentecostal Sermon he quotes from David,

"I beheld the Lord always before my face ;
For he is on my right hand, that I should not be moved ;
Therefore my heart was glad, and my tongue rejoiced ;
Moreover my flesh also shall dwell in hope :
Because thou wilt not leave my soul in Hades,
Neither wilt thou give thy Holy One to see corruption,"

making the prophecy apply to the death and resurrection of Jesus. And in 3 : 18 he says, "*But the things which God fore-shewed by the mouth of all the prophets that his Christ should suffer he thus fulfilled.*" He recognized this event as a part of that great scheme of prophecy, a fact which he had failed to recognize before the resurrection.

Not only had Peter learned this as a foretold event ; he had also come to recognize it as being in harmony with God's will, and hence, in some sense, of God's contriving. He says Jesus was delivered up "*by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God.*" And again he says that Herod, and Pontius Pilate, and the Gentiles, and the peoples of Israel, had conspired to do "*whatsoever thy hand and thy counsel foreordained to come to pass.*"

This, it seems to me, is a fair representation of Peter's view of Jesus' death at that time. He regarded it as a great crime ; but one that had been foretold, and permitted by God for the accomplishment of his own inscrutable purposes. This is plainly taught in the first chapters of Acts ; but nothing beyond this is taught there. We search those records of the early Church in vain for a statement of any connection whatever between the death of Christ and our salvation. That his death was a sacrifice, effecting redemption for men, or a means of atonement with God, Peter did not yet see. It is true he exhorted the Jews to be baptized in the name of Jesus, unto remission of sins, and told them that God had sent his Servant to bless them in turning them away from their iniquities ; but

this is a very different thing from our common doctrine of the atonement. He did not say how their sins were to be remitted; nor did he hint at any connection between that remission and Jesus' death. He simply preached faith in Christ as the expected Messiah, and taught that a hearty acceptance and following of him would turn them away from their sins, and bring them salvation. It is easy for us, with our inherited ideas, and dogmatic notions, to find more than this in these passages; but if we will empty ourselves of all preconceived thoughts, and honestly study the first chapters of Acts, putting ourselves back into that time, we will see that this is about all they teach on this subject.

While Peter did not yet see all the truth, he had made a distinct advance upon his former position; for he now recognized the despised cross as a part of God's plan, foretold by his prophets. How did this progress in thought come about? What influences opened Peter's eyes that he might see this much of the truth? I think we can find some of them. When the women who had followed him from Galilee went to the tomb on the resurrection morn and found not his body they were greatly troubled and perplexed, and just then, we are told, two angels appeared unto them, saying, "*Why seek ye the living among the dead? He is not here, but is risen: remember how he spake unto you when he was yet in Galilee, saying that the Son of man must be delivered up into the hands of sinful men, and be crucified, and the third day rise again. And they remembered his words, and returned from the tomb, and told all the things to the eleven, and to all the rest.*" Thus was recalled to them the Master's own words concerning the necessity of his death, and their minds were made to dwell on those words. After they realized his resurrection they could the more calmly and intelligently contemplate those dark sayings at which they had formerly been offended.

On the way to Emmaus the risen Lord had himself said to two of his disciples, "*O foolish men, and slow of heart to believe in all that the prophets have spoken? Behoved it not the Christ to suffer these things, and to enter into his glory?*" And then

beginning from Moses and from all the prophets, he interpreted to them the scriptures concerning himself. These words were promptly related to the whole band of believers, and doubtless went far toward opening their eyes.

And afterwards the Lord appeared unto the others where they were gathered together, and said unto them, "*These are my words which I spake unto you while I was yet with you, how that all things must needs be fulfilled which are written in the law of Moses and the prophets and the psalms concerning me. Then opened he their mind that they might understand the scriptures.*" In this way Jesus not only recalled these truths, but explained and applied them; and thus they finally came to see that his death, instead of disproving his claims to be the Messiah, was a necessary part of God's revealed plan, and hence really proved those claims.

But further than this they had not yet progressed. The cross, while foretold and permitted, was still regarded as a hindrance rather than a help. The fact that the Christ they preached had died this ignominious death was thought to be one of the chief things in the way of rapid spread of the Gospel. To ask men to believe on one who had been crucified seemed to them a hard thing, as it really was. The great problem of reconciling the humiliation and suffering of the cross with the glory and majesty of the Messianic King was still unsolved.

III. The third stage in the development of Peter's idea is that revealed in his epistles. There we have his matured view, which he held and taught in the last years of his life. And in regard to the significance of Christ's death it is very far in advance of his view when he made those speeches recorded in Acts.

Peter proclaims his final thought concerning the cross in I Peter 2:24, "*Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that we, having died unto sins, might live unto righteousness; by whose stripes ye were healed.*" And again in 3:18, "*Because Christ also suffered for our sins once, the righteous for the unrighteous, that he might bring us to God.*"

Here he undoubtedly teaches that Christ died in our stead, and that through his death we have remissions of sins. What is this but the Church's old doctrine of a vicarious atonement? Christ willingly endured his humiliation and suffering in our behalf; he hung upon the cross as our substitute, nailed there by our sins; he accomplished reconciliation, that is, "brought us to God," by his death.

Peter has at last learned the meaning of Isaiah's prophecy, "*Surely he hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows; yet we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God and afflicted. But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed. All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all.*" For does not Peter quote Isaiah's very words? "*By whose stripes ye were healed. For ye were going astray like sheep; but are now returned unto the Shepherd and Bishop of your souls.*"

He had at last reached a position, too, where he could appreciate his Lord's words and imbibe their spirit. Jesus had told him long before, "*The Son of Man came not to be ministered unto but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many*" (Mark 10 : 45). At the Last Supper he had solemnly proclaimed, when he gave them the cup, "*This is my blood of the covenant, which is shed for many unto remission of sins.*" Peter recalled these sayings, and repeated the same ideas almost in the same words, in his own statement of the purpose of Christ's death. At last he has come to see the truth as Jesus taught it to him in the olden time, when his eyes were blinded and his ears dull of hearing. Finally he is at one with his Master.

What circumstances brought about this great change in Peter's view? By what processes was he led on from that doubtful position shown in Acts to the higher and fuller ground on which he stood when he wrote the epistles? These epistles were written between the years 63 and 68; so that about thirty years had elapsed since the events recorded in the early chapters of Acts occurred. Doubtless he had given constant

thought to the subject, carefully reviewed all the Old Testament prophecies concerning the Messiah, and pondered long and deeply Christ's own words, during all those years. And we must never forget that the promised Spirit was now with him, to recall the things of Christ, to bear witness concerning Christ, and to guide him into all the truth. By long and deep meditation on these things under the guidance of the Spirit, he and the others were finally led to see the full truth about the cross.

It seems quite likely that Paul was the first to grasp fully the real meaning of the crucifixion. Not having been personally acquainted with the details of Christ's life, nor having experienced the humiliation and anguish of those trying days, perhaps his mind was more ready to free this great event from the accidental and temporal, and to see its real meaning, than were the minds of the other disciples. He had been directly taught in the mysteries of the faith by the Holy Spirit, and besides, he had a theological mind, capable of grappling with these great questions. So it is not unlikely that he first arrived at clear and definite convictions about some of them, and helped the other disciples to a clearer understanding of them, too. In Cor. 15 : 13, written about the year 57, Paul proclaims his doctrine of the cross, "*Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures.*" In Rom. 3 : 24-25, written about 58, he says, "*Being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus : whom God set forth to be a propitiation through faith by his blood.*" So Paul has already arrived at his conclusion long before Peter wrote the epistles. We learn from Gal. 1 : 13 that Paul had once spent fifteen days with Peter in Jerusalem, and during that time they must have conversed much about the deep things of their common faith. And does it not seem probable that this great subject of Christ's death, and its relation to our salvation, was one of the subjects of their conversation? Very likely Paul's clearer and more logical mind was able to help Peter to unravel some of the tangled threads of his thought, and see certain truths more fully and plainly than he had before.

This, then, is what I conceive to have been Peter's thought of the cross at the different stages of his life; at first it was a stumbling-block to him; next he recognized it as a part of God's plan, but did not understand the reason of it; and finally he came to see that it was the very culminating point in Christ's work, and the means whereby remission of sins and salvation are offered to men. And so to him, too, the cross, which had once meant ignominy and shame, came to be the beautiful symbol of reconciliation and atonement, so that he could glory in it, and rejoice when he was counted worthy to die upon it.

ARTICLE VIII.

CURRENT THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT.

I.

ENGLISH AND AMERICAN.

BY REV. M. COOVER, A.M.

In *The Bibliotheca Sacra* for January, the Rev. S. W. Howland describes *The Story of Eve's Creation* after the method of evolutionary development. The chief purpose of organic development was the evolution of a rational being. The divine Mover by the method of evolution developed life in ascending stages from the lowest organisms to that species of animal nearest man in physical constitution. From animal parents sprang the first pair of human creatures. The capabilities of human parenthood did not involve rational powers. The rational endowment came by supernatural action upon the animal soul descended from purely animal parentage. The initial moment of human existence was effected by a *superadditum* of rational power to the animal nature. The economy of evolutionary process would demand but one originaive action to produce the genus *homo*.

But the beginning of the human race as described in Genesis, chap. 2, represents the human pair as having separate and

different origins; man created from dust and inbreathed by God with spirit, and woman formed from man, a rib constituting the framework of a new personality. This surgical and structural method of erecting a helpmeet for Adam is poetical and not scientific or historic. The economy of natural forces indicates that Adam and Eve were brother and sister, twins of animal parents. One divine act, one brooding spiritual contact, produced a human pair in one matrix. At birth the human pair were united in body by cartilage as were the Siamese twins. The "ensiform cartilage," or breast bone, was probably the form of conjunction. This was torn asunder by accident, or intentionally, by the rude animal parents. In the wild state of nature the human pair were separated and lost to each other in early years before the advanced condition of intelligently observing personality. In the years of loneliness Adam marked the difference between himself and the animal creatures about him, and longed for a companion possessing the properties of his human personality. Then Eve came by casual meeting, and Adam found his counterpart. A bone protruded from her breast or side, which corresponded to the cartilaginous socket in his side, and Adam exclaimed, "bone of my bone, and flesh of my flesh." He thought a rib had been taken from his side around which a companion had been built; and he called her "woman, because she was taken out of man." It was during the sleep of infancy's self-unconsciousness that the separation took place, and in their union in maturity they were again one pair. The protoplasm of the primal germ under the one act of the divine economy developed into a human pair, which became the parents of an unbroken human race.

In his suggestive romance the Rev. Mr. Howland misses the true biological continuity of the human race in his advocacy of creationism as the theory of the origin of each human soul born into the world.

A more adequate hypothesis would regard creationism as a single divine act in the matrix of the animal parent. The theory of traducianism alone fits evolution. Propagation from

parental life by natural human descent carries all the properties of the human personality.

In the same number of the magazine, the editor, Dr. Wright, gives an account of the scientific opinions respecting the recently found *Lansing skull*. The skull is evidently of considerable antiquity, and yet it shows a brain capacity approaching that of the American Indian. The theory long in vogue among thoroughgoing evolutionists required an almost inestimable period of time for the development of *homo sapiens* from the anthropoid ape. The transformation by development was incomparably slow and gradual. Geological time necessary for the world's preparation for animal life was formerly estimated in the hundreds of millions, but astronomers and physicists have now reduced the time to twenty-four millions of years. The length of time formerly demanded by hypothesis for the advance of man from savagery attending his animal origin to civilized conditions has now also been much modified. No appreciable change in the capacity of the human skull can be observed from the earliest dawn of civilization in Egypt and Babylonia to the races occupying the same lands to-day. The *Neanderthal* skull of more western development, among the lowest in form, yet deemed human, was pronounced by Professor Huxley to be capacious enough for the brain of a philosopher.

The *Lansing* skull according to the older theory of evolution should be midway between the capacity of man and the ape. Guesses and presumption must give way to accumulating facts which go to substantiate a sudden rise of *homo sapiens* from previous conditions of animal life. Professor Wright says, "There is no adequate scientific evidence going to show that the origin of man, even on the evolutionary hypothesis, was not through a sudden leap, which may well involve a divine interference, and might properly be called a miracle."

Glacial man was not so very ancient. The stretch of time now granted by geologists does not permit a recession greatly beyond the period of historic antiquity in the East. The

"missing link" between the anthropoid ape and man seems, even on evolutionary principles, to be a "sudden leap," leaving no traces of any intermediate physical development. The missing connection may well be the divine or miraculous factor, producing the creature in the rational likeness of his Creator.

While primitive man is being proved to be more modern than was formerly supposed, his civilization also is now being pushed back to a greater antiquity to meet and coalesce with his primitive physical condition. We will shortly have more filial respect for our first parents when their social and economic conditions will have shown a supra-savage state with moral and spiritual development more becoming to beings having similitude to a rational Creator.

The discovery and decipherment of the *Code of Hammurabi* takes us back to a distinctive civilization dating about 2250 B. C., which is the product of preceding centuries of growth. Babylonia reached its prestige under king Hammurabi with a commercial, juridical and architectural elevation very commendable to trade, art, and jurisprudence. As the patron of agriculture the king constructed great systems of canals for the irrigation of the fertile plains.

Commerce demanded laws for the control of distant dependencies of the empire. The king could be omnipresent in his domain only by a codified legislative system executed by sub-officers and forms of magistracy. The inventive mind added to its wealth of retentive forces by cuneiform writing on the easily prepared loam of the river valley. Inscribed tablets preserved the past product of mind, and gave incentive to greater mental and educational achievements. For six centuries, or more, subsequent to King Hammurabi, the empire of Babylonia was supreme among the Eastern states. But after a thousand years, about the twelfth century B. C., the kingdom of Elam is found in the supremacy, and the treasures of Sippar find a home in Susa, the Elamitish capitol, there to await the spade of the excavator and the skill of the decipherer in the

twentieth Christian century. Fifteen months ago the Code of Hammurabi was discovered at Susa by M. de Morgan. It was first translated into French by Prof. Scheil; then into German by Dr. Winckler, from whose copy an English translation was made and published in the *Independent*, Jan. 8, 15, and 22, 1903. A complete English translation has been made by the Rev. H. C. W. Johns, Lecturer in Assyriology, Queens' College, Cambridge, to be issued by the press of T. & T. Clark. Comments on the code appear in *The Expository Times* for March by the Rev. Mr. Johns, and in *The Biblical World* for the same month by Professor Kent, of Yale.

The monument bearing the code represents King Hammurabi standing with rod and circle in hand before the sun-god of Sippar receiving the law. The front of the monumental slab bears 16, and the back 28 columns of legislation, about 3600 lines in all, giving three times the legislative matter contained in the Mosaic code.

There are 245 distinct laws decipherable. About thirty-five more, contained in five columns, were erased, or chiseled off by some king of Elam, probably for space to inscribe the glory of his own achievements. The code covers the regulation of matters social, economic, and judicial. A well organized society with a breadth of civilization is manifested by the character of the legislation. There are classified trades and professions; officers with specialized functions, occupations of wide commerce, a well ordered judiciary, and a central government with which the whole organized social order is co-ordinated. The wide-reaching acts of legislation embrace human rights and responsibilities in significant detail. Whether contractor or barber, tradesman or real estate agent, each finds his office and duty defined, with fees, wages, rent, and prices, all fixed by statute. Medicine and surgery as well as commercial engagements are found with their province described and fixed by law. It is purely a civil code. It contains no religious regulations. Comparison with the Mosaic code shows similarity in the civil enactments; but a deeper humanitarian spirit is manifested in the laws of the Hebrews, revealing superiority of moral concep-

tions. The Hebrew race was a sharer in the advance of civilizing culture and order. While the civil laws of Moses are not purely an immediate divine revelation, nor a creation of Hebrew genius, but a part of the legal conceptions of the great Semitic family, yet the superior moral imprint shows a divine superintendence, a divine addition through Hebrew agency. When Abram left Ur of the Chaldees for the west land, he came from the commanding civilization of ruling Hammurabi, bearing in memory and juridical temperament the laws of the East.

After ten centuries while the code of Hammurabi goes with an Elamitish conqueror to Susa, the Hebrew race comes out of Egyptian bondage and begins its national and legislative existence. No more direct connection between the codes of the two kingdoms is yet shown than that of the generally prevailing civil order and culture of politically paramount Babylonia. Distinctive divergences of dialect had long arisen separating an immediate coalescence of national conceptions and customs. The moral code of Moses has yet found no counterpart in Babylonia of the age of the Mosaic legislation.

To the historic consciousness required by an obdurate evolutionary hypothesis this signifies that the moral code of the Hebrews did not exist in the days of Moses. It is still recent that mistaken criticism denied the possibility of any literary culture in the Mosaic age. It was thought that civilization had not advanced far enough for any literary achievements in Israel before the time of David. It is still asserted that no laws could have been codified in Israel before the days of the prophets who wrote their message in the eighth century B. C., and that the Deuteronomic legislation originated in the sixth century B. C., following the imposition of the priest Hilkiah. The Tel el-Amarna tablets, 1400 B. C., disprove the lack of literary culture in western Asia. A wide-spread literary correspondence was then already prevalent. But exceeding all former conceptions of the antiquity of literature, the code of Hammurabi brings to light a distinctively high social order and intelligence in ancient Babylonia. As many centuries of pro-

gress most probably preceded Hammurabi's finished code as have elapsed since his clerks inscribed the laws for him on his monument. The high art of the artificer found in the tombs of the most ancient kings of Egypt, reigning in the fourth millennium before the Christian era; the materials for writing and the form of literary inscription, and the mode of burial, have revealed the fact that this ancient civilization came from Babylonia, which preceded Egypt with centuries of culture.

The mental photograph of the man of antiquity with its moral colors is not a bad picture. He seems to look not much the worse the older we find him. While archaeology supplies us with man's ancient products, and physical science brings him in his origin nearer to completer observation, we may not expect the boundaries of historic fact from each department to converge and the full perspective present us with historic man in his cradle, yet we may hope that a better perspective will reveal at least some dignity in his primitive condition.

The dignity of man is not lacking its defenders even among thorough-going evolutionists. Hypotheses may take an anthropological or a religious turn as well as serve mathematical and physical science.

Simultaneously with the *London Fortnightly Review* the *Independent* of February 26th, publishes an article on *Man's Place in the Universe* by Dr. Alfred Russel Wallace, the distinguished evolutionist. Dr. Wallace thinks that the universe was made for man; that our solar system occupies the center of the physical universe, and that the sole and sufficient purpose of the entire starry system is the evolution of the human soul. The certainties of the case are not of mathematical demonstration, for the matter constituting the discussion is in the distant bounds of the universe and incapable of perceptual analysis and synthesis. But Dr. Wallace offers a rational hypothesis combining conclusions of astronomical and physical science with inferences legitimately drawn from them. The hypothesis is no more incredible than many other deductions of evolutionary science.

As the universe is nothing without thought, it may well exist for the purpose of thought. Is the starry system infinite in extent? Is there no center because there is no circumference? Scrutiny by telescope and camera seems to show that there is a limit to stars, since in the outermost region of space they are fewer in number.

If stars were infinite in number and scattered in profusion through space, there would be no dark spaces between stars, and the heavens by night would be a dome of brilliancy giving light as intense as the sun at noonday. But the light furnished by all the stars is equal to but one-fortieth of our moonlight. But there are dark spaces called "coal sacks" where no stars exist, and beyond the outermost stars are regions of non-luminous space. There must be a center, for a circumference can be circumscribed. The "Milky Way," the great nebulous ring of star clusters, encircles the heavens, and bounds a disk in the plane of which our solar system occupies practically the center. We are center in a cluster of suns precisely located in the Galaxy and centrally placed in the plane. The physical conditions of our earth furnish the only possibilities for living creatures. Conditions of heat, gravity, and atmosphere, are suitable only on our sphere for human habitation. Spectrum-analysis shows the universe to be composed of the same elements as our globe, and existing under the same chemical and physical laws. The physical conditions of the stellar heavens show no adaptations for organisms like man. Summarizing his conclusions Dr. Wallace deems our solar system and our earth the centrally purposeful work of a beneficent and intelligent Creator producing man through ages of time and almost infinite wielding of a plastic universe.

At the request of the editor of the *Independent* Professor W. H. Pickering, of the Harvard observatory, makes reply to Dr. Wallace in the issue of March 12. Professor Pickering finds no fault with facts as stated by Dr. Wallace, but offers some objections to his conclusions. The stars are less numerous at the utmost bounds of the universe, but may not that be due to

an absorbent, non-luminous gas lying between the most distant visible stars and probable luminous bodies located beyond? Such non-luminous gas constitutes the "coal-sacks," the unoccupied dark regions in our own visible heavens. Our whole starry system may be but a little universe in one of these dark pockets, while infinite space beyond, separated by absorbent gases, may contain unbounded systems.

Professor Pickering admits that our solar system may be within one degree of the medial plane of the "Milky Way," but doubts that it is located within ten per cent of the radius of the central position in that plane. The original nebulae, however, from which our system sprang, most probably began to condense into stars in the vicinity which we occupy, so that our sun is one of the oldest, judging its solar type by the spectrum.

As to the physical conditions conducive to organic life on other spheres, we know very little. Mars manifests some prepossessing possibilities of climate and of surface conditions observable by the telescope.

The four planets beyond are less capable of scrutiny. Properties of heat and atmosphere may exist for animal life on one or more of them. Neptune, the outermost one, receives light from the sun intense as rays from an ordinary electric light at a distance of five or six feet, and judging from rotation and cloud formations, possibly possesses an atmosphere to which the conditions of organic life might be adapted. Yet Professor Pickering thinks "we cannot do better than adopt the views enunciated by that great astronomer, Sir William Herschel, that the stellar universe, as we know it, is in the form of a flattened disk, such as might be formed by two watch glasses, and that we are not far from the center of it." Hypothesis is simply met by hypothesis. The inferences of Dr. Wallace are not deemed impossible, nor unqualifiedly improbable, but only incapable of proof.

The field of argument is one of free opinion. The inferences are inconclusive, for the hypotheses are physically undemonstrable. One man's faith may accept them, another's predilection decline them. *Talis homines, qualis sententiae.*

The traditional conception of the nightly visit paid by Nicodemus to our Lord is that of a timid, man-fearing creature stealing through the streets of Jerusalem to an *Aliyah*, or upper room, to meet with Jesus.

But did Jesus ever stay in Jerusalem by night? Was it not his invariable custom to retire from the city in the evening and go out to the Mount of Olives, or to Bethany? Professor Ramsay, in his new book, *The Education of Christ: Hillside Reveries*, suggests that the "Man of Nazareth" was visited by Nicodemus on the Mount of Olives, where the quiet breezes whispered, and symbolized the Spirit's movements.

It was the miraculous in the deeds of Jesus that awakened the interest of Nicodemus and turned his thoughts discerningly to the source of the supernatural. Dr. Swete, of Cambridge, calls attention to the creeds in their declaration of the miraculous in the life of Jesus.

The Christian consciousness of the early Church expressing itself in respect of Gospel miracles in the framing of confessions gave prominence to the two miracles opening and closing our Lord's earthly career. These two, the Virgin Birth, and the Resurrection, and none other, find mention in the creeds. And these two are passive in the experiences of Christ, miracles of personality which Jesus himself underwent. The miracles wrought by Jesus, which lie between, are passed over by the creed framers. It is an evidence of the keenness of the religious consciousness that the early Church chose the fundamental principle of miraculous power. We are not justified, probably, in saying that the creed framers acted more wisely than they knew, but they gave expression to a very significant principle when they based the Christian faith on the supernaturalness of Christ's person, and not on the miraculousness of his deeds. The product of Christ's miraculous ministry follows naturally upon his personality as a supernatural product. Nicodemus was keen enough to discern that the deeds of Jesus were great, and yet not so great as the God who was with him. The product of divine action reverts to a divine source. The Virgin

Birth and the Bodily Resurrection are the two buttresses of the bridge of salvation; and these are the two miracles the validity and authenticity of which are now being so warmly contested. Incarnation becomes an inconsequence when the virgin birth is nullified. A genius becomes Savior. An ethical restoration takes the place of a divine atonement. And this demands for its accompaniment a Jesus who can be accounted for naturally, a life marvellous indeed, but ending in a death in a certain sense vicarious, but without sacrificial merit, followed by a spiritual rising into ethical oneness with God. But the bodily resurrection of Christ is the best attested of miracles, with evidences converging from both Gospels and Epistles. The conduct of persons and the strangeness of events can be psychologically and historically accounted for only on the plain statement of the facts as they are recorded. The evidence can be invalidated only by a *tour de force*. The strenuous desire for the banishment of the supernatural must resort to violent procedure in the handling of the records.

Professor Chase, President of Queens' College, Cambridge, in an address on the supernatural elements in the Gospels, recently delivered and printed, gives emphasis to the miracle of the Virgin Birth as recorded by Luke. This evangelist was careful, and in a large measure critical, in the choice and use of the materials and sources.

Luke was a companion of Paul, and Professor Chase thinks that during Paul's imprisonment at Cesarea Luke attended him, and while near to Jerusalem collected the materials and facts which compose his Gospel.

In gathering information from James and other members of the holy family he secured the facts relating to the Virgin Birth. His Gospel contains positive information respecting Christ's infancy, and not traditional fiction.

Gleanings from, and thoughts suggested by, articles in *The Expository Times* for February and March.

II.

GERMAN.

REV. S. GRING HEFELBOWER, A.M.

The first half of the fourth section of Hauck's *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands*, which appeared about ten months ago, has received very favorable notices from critics of very different theological tendencies. Yet this was to be expected, for the work is generally recognized as the most important contribution in the field of Church History that we are receiving at the present time, and as an historical work won for its author several years ago the Berlin medal, which is given for the most important contribution to history produced within the preceding five years. In fact Hauck is recognized as the greatest historian of the Middle Ages, whether ecclesiastical or secular, and was honored by a call to Ranke's chair in Berlin University, which he refused. At present Harnack is generally recognized as the world's greatest church historian, at least he is most widely known. But there are many who regard Hauck as his equal or superior; and even some of Harnack's disciples believe that their master has passed his zenith and that Hauck is still rising, in spite of the fact that he is Harnack's senior by seven years.

It will be interesting to note Hauck's observations on the conditions of the Church at the beginning of the twelfth century, with which this volume opens. (On the basis of review in *Theologische Rundschau*, Dec., 1902). Although the church institutions remained, they have a different content when compared with the conditions at the beginning of the ninth century. This can be noticed in the case of the episcopate, which, because of its political position, had sunk. The archdeaconate also showed change, for it constituted the greater part of the ecclesiastical activity of the Bishop. The pastoral office had also risen in importance, and the town parish sprung up in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. This was the work of the burgher class; and here for the first time laymen (not only

kings and princes) begin to be active in the Church. And with this a new factor enters into the church life, which is just as important as the new elements of piety. The religiousness of the beginning of the twelfth century has much more personal content than that of the early Middle Ages. The emancipation of the individual was appearing. Christian piety began to deepen; the break with ecclesiastical authority lay within the realm of the possible.

It is evident that Hauck placed this presentation of the conditions in the German Church at the beginning of this volume in order to prepare the way for a complete understanding of the new epoch in German Church History, which began with the Concordat of Worms, 1122. For Lothair of Saxony and Conrad III no longer lead the German Church, but, according to the principles of the Georgian party, recognize the Pope as over-lord, even in temporal affairs. The papal administration of the Church developed. But the results of this centralization were not fortunate; the papal court became the greatest business chamber in the world. Even the friends of the Curia complained of the evils of the papal rule, for it paid little attention to justice and righteousness, and fostered widespread discontent among the German peoples. The attempt to rule the Church from Rome was not successful. Such was the situation when Frederick Barbarossa appeared. It is true, he did not succeed in renewing the imperial influence on the papacy, yet in his relation to the German Church he was victorious. But his reign, so far as the future was concerned, meant only a fruitless reaction.

The twelfth century showed plainly that the secluded cloister life of the monk was at an end. He wanted work, with which he could sustain his intellectual and spiritual power. This accounts for the decline of the Benedictine order and the small results of the Cistercians. On the other hand the Augustinians became active in spiritual matters. If the monk was to remain an important element in the life of the Church, he must become an important element in the life of the cities. This was accomplished by the mendicant friars.

By calling attention to these and other chief view points, Hauck sheds much new light on the history of this period, and really succeeds in making that which is generally considered the driest portion of Church History interesting to read. In his hand the history of the late Middle Ages becomes a living, moving, coherent whole; viewed from one standpoint, it makes progress along many lines; viewed from another standpoint, which cannot escape the reader, the dark background is preparing, on which the light of the Reformation is to shine.

Though the problems that the fourth gospel presents are not the chief battle-ground between constructive and destructive criticism, they are involved, directly or indirectly, in almost all of the great New Testament questions of the day. Very few subjects in this field can be discussed without assuming some attitude to the fourth gospel. Several years ago, Arnold Meyer, of Bonn, published a small pamphlet, in which he gave what purported to be a *resumé* of recent critical study of the book as to the question of authorship. But his presentation was unfair and very misleading. He left the reader under the impression that there was scarcely anybody of scientific standing in all Germany who held the Johannine authorship of the fourth gospel. To show the utter falsity of such an impression, we mention the following leaders who defend it: Zahn, of Erlangen, Hauck and Ihmels, of Leipzig, Kaehler, Haupt and Loofs, of Halle (Kaehler the most influential conservative dogmatician of all Germany, Haupt rather liberal in tendency and Loofs a conservative Ritschlianist), Schlatter, of Tuebingen, Cremen, of Greifswald, and Seeberg, of Berlin, who, in spite of the negative spirit of that university, is probably already as influential as Kaftan. Harnack's view is that the book was written by the Presbyter John (Bousset and Delff are of the same opinion), who was closely associated with the Apostles, and was perhaps an eye-witness of many things in the life of Jesus. Loofs characterized this, in private conversation, as a foolish opinion (*eine thoerichte Ansicht*). Haupt said, when speaking

of Harnack's standpoint in an introductory lecture to the exegesis of the book, "I do not see what is the matter with the man that he persists in making such assertions." Even A. Meyer acknowledges (August, 1902) that confidence in tradition has been growing, though he adds that, in spite of this, the real genuineness and authenticity of the gospel seems to be past forever. He is also of the opinion that the tracing of the gospel to Gnostic sources is not at all likely to receive much consideration in the future.

Some conservative critics had begun to entertain the hope that the struggle was approaching an end. So many of the old objections to the genuineness and authenticity of the book seemed to have been overcome, so many of the reasons that men gave forty years ago for doubting were no longer mentioned, that they were justified in thinking that the end of the conflict was approaching. But appearances were deceiving. The growing silence along the old battle-line merely showed that there was a new battlefield, that destructive critical thought was finding a new place of attack. The favorite position of those who do not regard the fourth gospel as offering a trustworthy narration of events is that the author, perhaps John the Apostle, handled his materials very freely, even going so far as to change and make up events in the life of Christ, for the sake of presenting certain teachings. The theory that assigns the gospel to the Presbyter, who was perhaps a disciple of the Apostle, does not seem to have many advocates. One of the most recent solutions of the various problems connected with the fourth gospel seeks to find in it proof of sources and redaction. It is simply the application of the favorite method of critically studying the Old Testament to the real and imagined difficulties in John. In this way its advocates would satisfy both the claims of those who name the Apostle as the author, and the objections of others who claim a later origin. But, as was to be expected, though their method is essentially the same, their results differ widely.

Perhaps the most prominent advocate of this theory is Wendt, who advanced it about ten years ago in his *Lehre Jesu*. He claimed that the basis of our present gospel was a genuine

Johannine source containing utterances of Jesus. His position was severely criticized by almost everybody who wrote concerning it. But he continued working along the same line, and two years ago he published *Das Joh. Ev. Eine Untersuchung seiner Entstehung und geschichtlichen Werthes*, which is generally recognized as the most important presentation of the theory of sources that has appeared up to the present. We indicate briefly his method, and some of his results, on the basis of several reviews that have appeared.

No certain results can be reached from external testimony. The authority of the Gospel must rest on an investigation of its contents. Of course the norm for testing it must be the synoptics, however, with some limitations, for even in them there are added formations, which were developed farther in John. The early appearance of Jesus' Messiahship and the high estimate placed on miracles are marks of a later method of thought (*i. e.*, the dogmatizing of man), which, in the individual parts of John, appear much more plainly than in the first three gospels. In fact the author of the fourth Gospel not only evidently uses, but also prefers the secondary, later accounts of certain events which we find in the synoptics—all of which shows, according to Wendt, that the Apostle John, the eye-witness, could not have been the author of the whole book as we have it.

But Wendt finds a noticeable difference between the historical parts of the Gospel and the "words of Jesus," that are joined with them. In these addresses Jesus does not appeal to His miracles, but to His works, which include the entire working out of His calling, His acts of mercy and His making Himself known. Wendt claims that the evangelist misinterprets certain expressions of Jesus, *e. g.*, 11 : 19 and 22 ; 7 : 37 sq.; 12 : 32 and 33, and that history and quotations stand in evident wrong relation to each other, which is seen most plainly in 5 and 6, while the section 7 : 15-24 originally belonged immediately after 5. He also notes many other places in which the order has been changed, particularly in the closing address (as Spitta and Bacon), for 14 : 31 seems to be the real end. On the basis

of these and other like observations he concludes that a primitive collection of sayings of our Lord was used by a later hand, worked over and given historical relations, a sort of historical frame.

Wendt believes that he can go through the entire gospel in this way, and reconstruct this original source, though perhaps not in every individual instance, yet in all fundamental characteristics. The result is a sort of catalogue of the portions that probably made up this original document. The author of this collection of the sayings of Jesus speaks in the language of the Johannine letters, which influenced Ignatius and Justin, while they were not acquainted with the historical narrations of the fourth gospel. John the Apostle probably collected these sayings of Jesus, and some later writer, not wanting to see a gospel without a history, put it into its present form.

By this method Wendt gets rid of the bodily resurrection, the appearance of the resurrected Jesus and the "crass miracles" (such as that of Cana) of the fourth Gospel, *i. e.*, by one bold stroke of his creative fancy he sets aside all that which, granted that there is a supernatural, is very probable, in order that he might establish that which, on the basis of his many theories, is merely possible. By such a structure of hypotheses, one resting on the other, you can prove almost anything.

These speculations of Wendt, and those who follow the same general method, have received but little sympathy from the leading students of the New Testament in Germany. In fact he has been almost universally criticised, and generally with great severity. But the fad for the new, one might almost say for the sensational, in theology, will probably lead some of the younger theologians to take up and defend his theories, so that, though it is not at all likely that his views will exert any great or lasting influence, we must expect that he will find some zealous followers, and that his positions will be popular for a time within a limited circle.

Pastor Kupfers, of Gross-Lichterfelde near Berlin, has just published a pamphlet on the synoptic problem, which, in spite

of a pedantic appreciation of the greatness of his supposed discovery, is interesting because of the revolutionizing character of its conclusions. Wuttig, in his book on John's Gospel (1897), claims that the commonly accepted theory, that John wrote last of all, is not well founded, and that it is much more probable that his was the first Gospel written. This suggestion was taken up by a number of pastors who were well trained in theology, but by no university professor, so far as we have been able to learn. In this large pamphlet Kupfers, tries to fit this theory into the other gospels so as to form a complete picture of the genesis of all the gospels. In general John describes only Jesus' visits to Jerusalem at the feasts and leaves great gaps between, which Luke sought to fill out. Matthew seeks to give the exact chronological order of events in the life of Jesus. Mark had Matthew and Luke before him, and sought to give more accurate details, to be in a way supplemental. Kupfers dates the Gospels as follows: John soon after 44; Luke from 53 to 57; Matthew about 60; and Mark soon after 64. Schuerer of Goettingen in his criticism of the work puts the whole thing aside lightly, remarking that it is chiefly of pathological interest. However, the problem as to the inter-relations of the Gospels is far from being satisfactorily solved, and it may be that the traditional late dating of John is wrong. Inspector Jaeger of the Tholuck Konvikt in Halle is thoroughly convinced that the fourth Gospel has much greater historical value than most scholars are willing to recognize in it, and doubts the traditional late dating. There are other scholars of New Testament Introduction who are of the same opinion.

ARTICLE IX.

REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE.

FLEMING H. REVELL COMPANY, CHICAGO, NEW YORK, TORONTO.

Theologia, or the Doctrine of God. Outline notes based on Luthardt. By Revere Franklin Weidner, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Theology in the Chicago Lutheran Theological Seminary. Author of "Studies in the Book," "Christian Ethics," "Biblical Theology," "Theological Encyclopaedia," etc.

The title of the book is drawn from the old terminology, as the usual designation of the subject. The plan of presentation is comprehensive and incorporates, besides what strictly belongs to *Theologia*, a large measure of what belongs to Apologetics, in relation both to the existence of God and the reality of a supernatural revelation from Him. The content of the book is further enlarged by the inclusion of what may be called theology, in notice of doctrinal development and the diversities of view by the dogmaticians of different churches. The discussion of the subject is made to follow the order: (1). The teaching of the Old Testament. (2). The teaching of the New Testament. (3). The teaching of the Dogmaticians. (4). Modern criticism of the doctrine. This order is illuminative.

The presentation of the doctrine, though given only in outline statement, is so arranged as to treat of all its usual divisions and branches and offer to the student or reader a compendious systematic view, such as the conservative theologian would furnish as guidance and suggestion for study in a theological school. The *Outline Notes* are, indeed, as the author informs us, the result of twenty years' discussion in the class-room, and have gradually assumed the present form. Though based in the main on Luthardt's Compendium, the author has by no means limited himself to what was there available, but has enriched the material by his own statements and by a vast amount of quoted matter from Christian writers, both theologians and philosophers, of all periods and almost all branches of the Church. He has thus supplied a great wealth of helpful suggestion for the use of the discriminating reader or student. We welcome the work as an able and valuable contribution to our aids for theological study.

M. VALENTINE.

GINN AND COMPANY, BOSTON.

The Future of War in its Technical, Economic and Political Relations. By Jean De Bloch. Translated by R. C. Long, and with a conversa-

tion with the author by W. T. Stead, and an introduction by Edwin D. Mead. Published for the International Union. (7½ x 5½; pp. LXXIX, 380).

This is a translation from the last volume of a monumental work on *The Future of War* published about six years ago. The author will be remembered as the wealthy founder of the remarkable museum at Lucerne, in which "by pictures, panoramas, models, charts and other means the real character and significance of modern warfare should be brought home to the actual perception of men and women who now have no adequate comprehension of what war is." Jean de Bloch was a Polish Jew, who, from the humblest origin became the leading banker of Poland. From his youth he had studied and written much on military subjects with the purpose of discouraging war. Unlike the peace societies he considered war from the business side. He attended the Hague Conference as a learner, but was accepted as a teacher. His death in the beginning of 1902 deprived the world of a most important worker in the cause of humanity and peace. These and other facts Mr. Stead gives us in the Introduction.

The thesis which M. Bloch vigorously defends is that war between great nations has become impossible. He finds his reasons chiefly in the destructiveness of modern weapons, the costliness of war equipment, the use of smokeless powder, the exposure of trade upon the sea and the need in nearly all populous countries of more food than is produced at home. He furnishes a large number of maps and diagrams to illustrate possible campaigns, to show the effect of fire from various arms, the expenditures of belligerents, the mortality from disease, the growth of population, the exhaustion of the necessities of life and whatever other matters bear upon warlike resources. These calculations, which have been carefully made and many of which are useful in other discussions, add greatly to the value of the book and put it immeasurably beyond all sentimental treatises on the horrors of war.

J. A. HIMES.

Addresses on War. By Charles Sumner. With an introduction by Edwin D. Mead. Pp. xxvii, 319.

The contents of this book are, besides the Introduction, "The True Grandeur of Nations," pp. 1-132; "The War System of the Commonwealth of Nations," pp. 133-229; "The Duel between France and Germany," pp. 241-319.

Mr. Mead's *Introduction* is mainly occupied with a bibliographical account of Mr. Sumner's *Addresses*, and gives much valuable information. Mr. Sumner's oration on *The True Grandeur of Nations* is, without doubt, the most formidable attack on war ever made, and is in logic and learning one of the most splendid orations ever delivered on any subject. It was delivered in Tremont Temple, July 4th, 1845, and

at once gave its author more than a national fame. His biographer says: "Had he died before this event, his memory would have been only a tradition with the few early friends who survive him. The 4th of July, 1845, gave him a national, and more than a national fame." Its chief burden is the exhibition of the cruelty, wickedness, horror, misery and unjustifiableness of war, or of the appeal to the ultimate tribunal, as a mode of securing the rights of a nation or of vindicating its honor. He shows the barbarous and wicked nature of such mottoes as *In Times of Peace Prepare for War; My Country, Right or Wrong, My Country*. The enormous cost of armies and navies is eloquently contrasted with the cost of education, and the cruelty and wickedness of war are shown to be absolutely contradictory to the spirit of Christianity, which shows that the author fully understood the peaceful mission of the Prince of Peace. The following passage is worthy to be hung as an apple of gold in a picture of silver: "The True Greatness of a Nation cannot be in triumphs of the intellect alone. Literature and art may enlarge the sphere of its influence; they may adorn it; but in their nature they are but accessories. *The True Grandeur of Humanity is in moral elevation, sustained, enlightened, and decorated by the intellect of man.* The surest tokens of this grandeur in a nation are that Christian beneficence which diffuses the greatest happiness among all, and that passionless, Godlike justice which controls the relations of the nation to other nations, and to all the people committed to its charge" (p. 126).

In defending and illustrating his position the author appeals to poetry, history, philosophy and statistics. His learning as shown in this oration was simply prodigious.

More than twenty years ago we read this oration for the first time. The impression it made upon us was such that we have not ceased to this day to disclaim against war as utterly unjustifiable under any and all circumstances. Had the \$300,000,000 expended by the U. S. in the war with Spain about Cuba, and the still larger sum expended in the war in the Philippine Islands, been expended in education and in the promotion of the arts of peace, all parties concerned would be in better condition, and would doubtless be happier.

The address on the *War System of the Commonwealth of Nations*, was delivered before the American Peace Society, in Boston, May 28, 1849. In learning and eloquence, in the denunciation of the cruelties and barbarities of war, and in the earnestness of its pleading for the disarmament of the nations, and for the cultivation of peaceful relations between the nations of the earth, the address is a worthy companion of its elder brother.

The lecture on *The Duel between France and Germany*, was delivered in Boston, October 26, 1870. It is a thorough *exposé* of the duplicity that entered into the challenge on the part of France, and

closes with some important lessons to the nations. But this Address ought to be read in connection with Sir Rowland Blennerhasset's article in the December, 1902, No. of *The National Review* on *The Formation of the German Empire*, which exposes the craft and deceitfulness of Bismarck in rousing the German governments against France.

The Christian tone of this book is its crowning merit. We heartily wish that it might be read by every Christian minister and every student in the land. *The International Union* has done a good work in bringing together and publishing these *Addresses*. Let them be read, studied and in sentiment echoed wide over the earth.

J. W. RICHARD.

A. C. ARMSTRONG AND SON, NEW YORK.

Erormanga, The Martyr Isle. By the Rev. H. A. Robertson, edited by John Fraser, B.S., LL.D. Pp. xx and 467.

Erormanga is an island of the New Hebrides group, about 100 miles in circumference. It was first visited by foreigners in 1774 during one of the notable voyages by Captain Cook, who met a hostile reception at the hands of the natives. For fifty years thereafter little was known of the island. When, however, the discovery was made that the sandal tree flourished there, the island was overrun with unprincipled traders who made large fortunes out of the sandal-wood which was exported to China. Until the wood was practically exhausted the island was the scene of cruelty and rapine. The cannibal natives were incited to fueds and were filled with hatred toward the white man.

The story of Erormanga is told in simple and graphic language by Mr. Robertson who, with his family, has spent thirty years on the island. It was written at the earnest solicitation of his friends in Canada and elsewhere. About a third of the book is historical and the balance autobiographical.

Erormanga is called "The Martyr's Isle" on account of the atrocious murder of early missionaries. John Williams, "The Apostle of Polynesia," and his friend James Harris, had no sooner set their feet upon the island in 1839 than they were beaten to death by the natives. Nevertheless native teachers from neighboring islands were sent there and succeeded in gathering a few converts. Yet when Rev. George N. Gordon and Ellen his wife were settled there in 1857, they, too, were murdered after four years of faithful service. When the news of their martyrdom reached their home in Canada, Mr. Gordon's brother, James, at once determined to prepare himself to go to Erormanga in order to convert the murderers of his brother. He arrived there in 1864, and was joined in 1867 by Rev. James Macnair who died three years later. He toiled alone until 1872, when he met his brother's fate. He was slain while revising his brother's translation of the Acts. He

had reached the words of the first Christian martyr, "Lord Jesus receive my spirit. * * * Lord lay not this sin to their charge" when the cruel blow of the assassin was struck. He fell with his face on the manuscript baptizing it with his blood.

After the death of Gordon, in the same year came Robertson. He had spent several years in the group as an employe of a business firm. Impressed with the need of gospel workers he went to his home in Canada and prepared himself to become a missionary, and returned under the auspices of the Presbyterian Church. For the last thirty years he has labored with untiring zeal amid the perils of earthquakes, tidal waves and heathenism, winning the island for Christ. His story is practically the diary of a consecrated missionary. We see the man as he is—strong, tireless, courageous, good-humored and full of faith. Among the typical triumphs of his work was the building of the Martyrs' Memorial Church in 1880 from contributions made in New South Wales. "The foundation was laid by Usuo, the second son of Amoi-amoi, the murderer of John Williams."

The book deserves a place in the missionary library alongside of such volumes as the Autobiography of John T. Paton, who is Mr. Robertson's fellow-laborer in the same group. The volume is handsomely illustrated, attractively bound, and printed in good type. An appendix on "the natural features of the New Hebrides" by Alexander Morrison, Government Botanist of West Australia, completes the volume.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN AND CO., BOSTON, MASS.

Charles A. Conant, whose practical experience in financial affairs, and skill as a writer always attracts attention to his contributions, opens the April *Atlantic* with a striking article on "The Functions of the Stock Exchange," in which he makes many startling statements and revises many generally accepted opinions and ideas as to the duties and uses of stock exchanges.

"The Foe of Compromise," by William Garrott Brown, is an unusual paper and one which challenges attention. The "foes of compromise" are those exceptional characters who never waive their own opinions or principles, but fight for them unyieldingly to the end, without retraction or qualification, and thereby continually force the temporizing multitude to a higher plane.

Other notable papers are a collection of hitherto unpublished and extremely interesting letters exchanged between Emerson and Herman Grim, edited by F. W. Holls; "The Honorable Points of Ignorance," a characteristic paper by S. M. Crothers, treated in the delightful vein of mingled wit and humor which the readers of the *Atlantic* know so well; and an article by Brander Matthews, an acknowledged authority, on "The Makers of the Drama of To-day."

J. T. Trowbridge continues his "Own Story" with more of his Bos-

ton experiences, including recollections of some of Boston's early publishers, and reminiscences of Emerson, Alcott and Hawthorne.

In fiction, A. S. Hardy's "His Daughter First" continues its entertaining and puzzling course. Shorter stories and essays are: "The Rose-Red Glow," a Henderson story, by R. E. Young; "The Service of Mammon," by Virginia Remnitz; "Hy-a-a-ar! Dump," a lively dog story, by Beirne Lay.

Essays and sketches are furnished by Anna Schmidt, Harriet Waters Preston, and A. V. G. Allen. Poems are contributed by Henry Van Dyke, Francis Sterne Palmer, Wilfred Campbell, and James Herbert Morse; and a brilliant Contributors' Club completes the number.

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY, NEW YORK.

Lux Christi, An Outline Study of India. By Caroline Atwater Mason. Paper 12mo. Pp. 280. Price 30 cents.

This book is the second volume of a series of text books for the study of Missions. The series was called into being by the Ecumenical Conference of Foreign Missions held in 1900, which decided on a movement for systematic mission studies among women's foreign mission societies.

Lux Christi is a study of India. The author pursues no historical method, and follows no logical procedure in the handling of the material. The work is a collection of excerpts from many writers.

The book brings to the reader a great store of illuminative truth in an encyclopedic form, and will furnish profitable hours of study to circles of missionary workers.

M. COOVER.

EATON AND MAINS, NEW YORK.

The Healing of Souls. A Series of Revival Sermons. By Rev. Louis Albert Banks, D.D. Pp. 302. Price \$1.50.

The thirty-one sermons constituting this volume were preached in Grace Methodist Episcopal Church at revival services held in January, 1902. After brief exegetical treatment of the chosen texts the sermons become clusters of anecdotes or a series of illustrations. The fervent discourse designed to bring the heart to resolution and the will to action does not always make a spiritually readable sermon. The animation of the speaker and the emotion of the occasion cannot be reproduced in cold type. The factors which work powerfully on the emotional nature, and incite faith and moral action, may not be greatly educative or theological. The sermon that brings the hearer to prompt decision can be most efficient, and yet from its nature be ephemeral in its influence. The sermon with elements mainly emotional rather than educational lacks qualities which give long life. The preponderance of spiritual power with the thought-element alone produces a perduring sermon.

M. COOVER.